



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

HARVARD UNIVERSITY



**LIBRARY OF THE
GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF EDUCATION**

Compliments of Henry J. May

THE MANITOBA

SCHOOL QUESTION.

117-1551

*"And you claim the liberty of teaching. Stop! Be sincere; let us understand the liberty which you claim. It is the liberty of not teaching. You wish us to give you the people to instruct. Very well. Let us see your pupils. Let us see those you produced. What have you done for Italy? What have you done for Spain? For centuries you have kept in your hands, at your discretion, at your school, these two great nations, illustrious among the illustrious. What have you done for them? I shall tell you. * * Italy—which has taught mankind to read—now knows not how to read! * * Spain, thanks to you, a yoke of stupor, which is a yoke of degradation and decay."—VICTOR HUGO.*

BY

F. C. WADE,
Barrister-at-law.

WINNIPEG.

1895.

Printed at the Manitoba Institution for the Deaf and Dumb.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
MONROE C. GUTMAN LIBRARY

LC504
.M3W11



TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.—Introduction.

CHAPTER II.—The Old System.

CHAPTER III.—Bad Features of the Old System.

CHAPTER IV.—Distribution of the Legislative Grant.

CHAPTER V.—Some Practical Difficulties which make a Dual System impossible.

CHAPTER VI.—Changes made by the acts of 1890—National Schools.

CHAPTER VII.—Did the acts of 1890 introduce Protestant exercises or confiscate Roman Catholic property.

CHAPTER VIII.—Reasons for passing the acts of 1890.

CHAPTER IX.—Manitoba followed the example of the civilized world.

CHAPTER X.—The four arguments for a return to the old system.—No. 1.—The conscience argument.

CHAPTER XI.—No. 2.—The Treaty argument. The Hierarchy and the Rebellion of 1869-70.—A chapter left out of Mr. Ewart's book.


CHAPTER XII.—No. 2.—The Treaty argument—The "Parliamentary Compact" absurdity—An interesting photograph and some hitherto unpublished facts about Bill of Rights No. 4.

CHAPTER XIII.—No. 3.—The legal argument—The Roman Catholic appeal heard by a committee of politicians at Ottawa who did not sit as a Judicial body.

CHAPTER XIV.—No. 4.—The Gospel of Despair as preached by Dr. Grant—Confederation precedents do not apply and history is all the other way.

CHAPTER XV.—The Grant letters—A series of misstatements—How Dr. Grant copied Socrates.

CHAPTER XVI.—Conclusion—The Remedial Order folly—What it means—The "grievance is technical—Duty of the Ottawa Government.



Ed. 1898, 113

THE MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

"The system of education embodied in the Acts of 1890 no doubt commends itself to, and adequately supplies the wants of the great majority of the inhabitants of the Province" (of Manitoba).—From judgment of Privy Council in the Referred case.

"It is not the law that is at fault; it is owing to religious convictions, which everybody must respect, and to the teaching of their church, that Roman Catholics and members of the Church of England find themselves unable to partake of advantages which the law offers to all alike."—From judgment of Privy Council in City of Winnipeg v. Barrett.

CHAPTER I.

THE PRESENT SITUATION.

~~From~~
From the year 1890, when the new educational law of Manitoba was enacted, until quite recently, the Dominion Government managed to keep the now celebrated school controversy out of the House of Commons, and to confine it to the Courts of Justice. With the passage of the remedial order in March last all this was changed. The question is now a political one. - A government has been found in Canada willing to declare that, as a matter of public policy, it is more important that some alleged

grievance of the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba should be remedied by the restoration of their schools as they were previous to 1890, than that national schools should continue to exist in that Province.

BARRETT VS. WINNIPEG.

The Dominion Government, in pursuance of its declared policy, has issued what is known as the remedial order. This remedial order purports to be based upon the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on the case referred by the Governor-General in Council. It is not contended that the legislation complained of by the Roman Catholic minority was beyond the powers of the Province to pass. The minority first took up that position, but the decision of the Judicial Committee in *Barrett vs. The City of Winnipeg* necessitated a change of base. It was held that the Province had full power to pass the Public Schools' Act of 1890, and that it did not prejudicially affect any right or privilege with respect to denominational schools which the Roman Catholics possessed, by law or practice, in the Province at the union. In other words, the Roman Catholics had acquired no rights or privileges with respect to denominational schools at the union, and the legislation of 1890 could not conflict with sub-section 1 of section 22 of the Manitoba Act.

THE APPEAL TO OTTAWA.

The minority then fell back upon sub-section (2) of section 22, which provided for an appeal to the Governor General in Council from any act or decision of the legislature of the Province, or of any provincial authority, affecting any right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in relation to education.

Their appeal was sent in by way of petition on the 26th day of November, 1892. They admitted that no rights or privileges had been acquired previous to the union, but pointed out that the second sub-section was wider in its terms than the first and provided for an appeal to the Governor General in Council against legislation affecting rights acquired at any time including rights or privileges conferred after the union. They contended that the Act passed by the Manitoba Legislature in 1871, and amending Acts established a system of separate schools and conferred rights

and privileges which were taken away by the Acts of 1890. To strengthen their position they sought to make it appear that the Act of 1871 had been passed to carry into effect the provisions of an alleged clause in the bill of rights which was submitted by the people of the territory of the future province as a condition of their entry into the union and accepted by the Dominion and Imperial authorities.

THE REFERRED CASE.

Before entertaining the appeal asked for by the minority the Governor General in Council decided to ask the Courts if the appeal was an appeal that could be heard under the terms of sub-section (2) of section 22 of the Manitoba Act. On the 20th of February, 1894 the Supreme Court of Canada held that no appeal lay and that the Governor-General in Council had not the power to make the orders asked for. On the 29th of January, 1895 the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council reversed the judgment of the Supreme Court. They decided that the Governor-General in Council had power to hear the appeal inasmuch as the Acts of 1890 affected rights or privileges of the Roman Catholic minority in relation to education within the meaning of sub-section (2) of section 22 of the Manitoba Act. The Court was not required to determine what particular rights or privileges of the minority had been affected, and purposely refrained from doing so. It was intimated however, that it was certainly not essential that the statutes repealed by the Act of 1890 should be re-enacted. The "system of Education embodied in the Act of 1890," they added, "no doubt commends itself to and adequately supplies the wants of the great majority of the inhabitants of the Province." If this system were supplemented by suitable provisions all ground of complaint would be removed.

THE APPEAL PROCEEDS.

After the decision of the Judicial Committee was given the Governor-General in Council proceeded to hear the appeal, which came on for further hearing on the 26th day of February and the 5th, 6th and 7th days of March last. The result of their deliberations was the passage of the remedial order of the 19th of March last. By this order they required the Province of Mani-

toba to restore to the minority the following alleged rights :—

(a) The right to build, maintain, equip, manage, conduct and support Roman Catholic schools in the manner provided for by the said statutes which were repealed by the two acts of 1890 aforesaid.

(b) The right to share proportionately in any grant made out of the public funds for the purpose of education.

(c) The right of exemption of such Roman Catholics as contribute to Roman Catholic schools from all payment or contribution to the support of any other schools.

For all practical purposes they required that the statutes repealed by the legislation of 1890 should be re-enacted so far as Roman Catholics are concerned, and that the system of education embodied in the act of 1890, and declared by the Judicial Committee to adequately supply the wants of the great majority of the inhabitants of the Province should be annihilated. To conceal the fact that they were acting politically in their deliberations, the Committee of the Dominion Government which heard the appeal assumed for the time being the state and trappings of a judicial tribunal. The trick, however, was too transparent, and deceived very few. It is pretty well understood throughout the Dominion that the only question for the committee to consider was whether it was more important that some rights by way of special privilege formerly belonging to the Roman Catholic minority should be restored than that national schools should be maintained in Manitoba. The decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council left them free to act as they might see fit. They have chosen to side with the Roman Catholic church and against the whole people of Manitoba.

MANITOBA'S REPLY.

Manitoba's answer was submitted to the Provincial Legislature on June 13th last, and adopted on the 19th day of the same month. It was pointed out that the remedial order demanded the restoration of the old school laws which had been found inefficient ; that the policy of 1890 had been adopted after a careful examination of the system previously prevailing ; that, under the old system, many people grew up in a state of illiteracy ; that, apart from the objections to separate schools on principle, the weight of school taxation and the sparseness of settlement made it impossible to carry on a double system of schools. It was urged also

that the Ottawa authorities had demanded the restoration of the old system without obtaining full and accurate information as to its working, and the Province expressed its willingness to co-operate with the Dominion Government in making a thorough investigation of the whole subject. Legal difficulties were referred to. Hasty action was deprecated, and a strong appeal was made to the Dominion Government to exercise the greatest care and deliberation in dealing with a question of so vast importance affecting the religious feelings and convictions of different classes of the people of Canada and the educational interests of this Province, which is expected to become one of the most important in the Dominion.

Upon receipt of the Manitoba Government's reply the Dominion Government, after a short delay, announced itself as being committed to the policy of remedying the alleged wrongs of the Roman Catholics. The announcement was made in Parliament that Manitoba would again be requested to act and that in the event of a refusal on the part of the Province the Dominion Government would call Parliament in January, 1896 and introduce legislation to force compliance with the Catholic demands. The request to Manitoba has been made but the Provincial Government has not as yet made any reply. Should the reply be a refusal the question will then be for the Parliament of Canada to deal with and that body must decide whether or not it will attempt to coerce Manitoba.

CHAPTER II.

THE OLD SYSTEM.

In discussing the many and important issues embraced in the present controversy the first requisite must be an intelligent comprehension of the system which formerly existed and which it is sought to restore by means of the remedial order.

For this purpose it is not necessary to consider the condition of the Province educationally previous to the Union.

Before Manitoba became a portion of the Dominion there were no school laws within its boundaries, and no public schools. There were, in the words of the late Archbishop Tache, a number of schools for children. They were denominational schools, some of them being regulated and "controlled by the Roman Catholic Church, and others by various Protestant denominations."

The origin and history of these schools are well known. They were carried on by the Anglican, Roman Catholic and Presbyterian bodies, but they were in all cases purely private enterprises supported by fees and out of church funds. The Roman Catholics had no interest in the Anglican or Presbyterian schools, nor had the latter any interest in or control over the schools of the former.

There was no public system, nor was there any educational law. There was no exemption of denominational schools from taxation for public school purposes, for the plain reason that there was no public school tax. The Roman Catholics possessed no privileges in respect to education either by law or practice previous to the Union of which they have since been divested by legislation. Such was the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of Barrett vs. the City of Winnipeg, and for that reason there is no object in making any extended reference to the schools existing before 1870 in the territory which afterwards became the Province of Manitoba.

THE EDUCATIONAL ACT OF 1871.

Interest does attach, however, to the system of schools established at the first session of the Provincial Legislature, in 1871. In that year an Act was passed empowering the Legislature to appoint not less than ten nor more than fourteen to be a Board of Education for the Province, of whom one half were to be Catholics and

the other half Protestants. The Board was divided into two sections, Protestant and Catholic, with one Superintendent of Protestant and one of Catholic schools.

The moneys granted for educational purposes were granted evenly, one half going to Protestant, and the other half to Catholic schools. In 1875 the Board was increased to twenty-one, twelve Protestants and nine Roman Catholics, and the division of the educational grant was re-arranged, each section receiving a share proportioned to the school population. It was provided that the establishment of a school of one denomination in a district should not prevent the establishment of a school of a different denomination in the same district. Each section was given control over the management and discipline of the schools of its faith, and the power of prescribing the books to be used in the schools under its care. There was this saving clause, however, "provided always that for the Catholic section of the Board, in the case of books having reference to religion and morals, such choice shall be subject to the approbation of the competent religious authority." In this matter the Archbishop was by the school law of Manitoba placed in a position of complete supremacy so far as the Roman Catholic section was concerned.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC SECTION.

The meetings of the Roman Catholic section were from its first organization and nearly always afterwards held at the Archbishop's Palace in the French town of St. Boniface. The minutes of these meetings were kept in the French language. The members of the section were nearly all Priests, and, in nationality, French. The Archbishop of St. Boniface presided over the Roman Catholic section. The law provided that he should exercise a supervising and veto power in the choice of all books bearing on religion and morals, and in practice his powers were much more extensive.

TEACHERS CERTIFICATES FOR THE PRIESTS AND SISTERS.

The schools themselves were at an early date placed almost completely in the hands of the late Archbishop, his French priests and ecclesiastics. On the 4th of September 1879 a resolution was passed by the Roman Catholic section "that the members of the Clergy and of the religious communities who desire to consecrate themselves to education be granted certificates on the recom-

"mendation of the Ecclesiastical authority who will submit the "necessary examinations." What these examinations were it is impossible to tell, but on the 19th of August 1880 the late Archbishop submitted the following report :—

"In accordance with the authority received from the Catholic "section of the Bureau of Education by a resolution adopted at "its session of the 4th of September 1879, I recommend that "certificates be granted to the persons hereinafter mentioned :—

FIRST CLASS CERTIFICATES

French Course.

- Reverend J. D. Quevillon, priest
 " Michel Charbonneau, priest
 " Father A. Madore, O. M. I.
 " A. Pelletier, priest
 " T. Rene, ecclesiastic
 " Brother Bertram
 " Sister Marie Xavier
 " Sister Marie Martin de l'Ascension
 " Sister Marie Florentine

English Course.

- Reverend J. T. Quevillon, priest
 " Father A. Madore, O. M. I.
 " Brother Bertram
 " Sister Marie Xavier
 " Sister O'Brien
 " Sister Marie Martin de l'Ascension
 " Sister Marie Florentine.

SECOND CLASS

French Course.

- Reverend F. Brouillard
 " Brother Mulvihill, O. M. I.
 Reverend Sister MacDougall
 " Sister Goulet
 " Sister Desnoyers
 " Sister Fiset
 " Sister Royal
 " Sister Brazeau
 " Sister Boire

- " Sister St. Placide
- " Sister Delorme
- " Sister Marie Leontine

English Course.

Reverend Brother Mulvihill, O. M. I.

- " Brother William
- " Sister MacDougall
- " Sister Goulet
- " Sister Desnoyers

THIRD CLASS

French Course.

Reverend Sister Desautels

- " " Derome
- " " Ste Anne

English Course.

Reverend Brother Joseph

- " " M. A. Morin, Ecclesiastic
- " Sister Marie Rosanna.

The report was duly received and adopted and the Superintendent was instructed "to forward to each of the persons mentioned "the certificates accorded," and thus were many of the teachers made in the Roman Catholic schools.

A very large number of Ecclesiastics were certificated in the same manner in June 1886 and more again in December 1888.

PRIESTS FOR INSPECTORS.

While the schools were taught to a great extent by the parish priests, the Reverend Maristes Brothers, the faithful Companions of Jesus, the Reverend Sisters of Charity, and the Reverend Sisters of Jesus and Mary, selected and certificated in the way just pointed out, the inspectors consisted of priests solely. The following is a list of the Inspectors of Schools re-appointed by resolution of the Catholic section, Nov. 3rd, 1888 :—

Rev. M. R. Giroux,
 Rev. M. Fillion,
 Rev. M. Theobald Bitsche,
 Rev. M. T. Campeau,

Rev. M. A. Dugas,
 Rev. Pere Allard,
 Rev. M. Martin,
 The Rev. M. Kavanagh,
 Rev. M. Bernier,
 The Rev. Pere Decorby.

(Minute Book No. 2. pp. 223-4)

These inspectors were required to report to the Catholic section, among other things, whether there was a crucifix or some religious image in each school visited. (Memoir of 1886, p. 36)

PROGRAMME OF STUDIES.

The programme of studies in these schools comprised seven divisions. A first class certificate was necessary to teach up to and including the seventh division ; a second class certificate to teach to the sixth division inclusively ; a third class certificate, to and to include the fourth division, and a certificate of the fourth class was requisite to teach in the two first divisions. The divisions are given in the memoir prepared by the Roman Catholic section for the Colonial Exposition at London in 1886, but it is only necessary here to cite the first :—

First Division.

1. Religious Instruction—Prayers and preliminary questions of the catechism.
2. Useful Knowledge—Questions on the senses and the division of time.
3. Decorum—Propriety, good behavior, respect due to parents and masters.
4. Vocal Music—Easy chants.
5. Spelling—On the board, in the book, and by heart.
6. Reading—On the board and in the spelling book.
7. Arithmetic—Numeration written and spoken, Arabic figures from 1 to 1,000, addition and subtraction from 1 to 20.

The same subjects were taught in each division, history, grammar, composition and geography being added in all the rest, drawing in the fifth, sixth and seventh divisions and agriculture in the sixth and seventh. (See programmes of all divisions, appendix A).

CREED AND DOGMA EVERYWHERE.

An examination of the programmes for the seven respective divisions will show that religious instruction in one form or another constituted a very large portion of the entire work of the schools.

Vocal music, for instance, in the second division consisted of songs and hymns ; in the third, church chants ; in the fourth, plain chants ; in the fifth, hymns and psalms ; and in the sixth, anthems. History in the second, third and fourth divisions was confined to the Old and New Testaments.

A third division of the programme of studies consisted of "bienseance" or decorum, under which pupils were taught among other things how to address a letter to a prelate or a priest, how to terminate such letters, what titles to employ in conversation in addressing such persons, how to behave in a holy place, order of precedence, the titles of dignitaries, and so forth. A fourth division of the programme consisted of religious instruction, in Butler's catechism, the creed, the sacraments ; in the fourth division the commandments and "the unseen part of the catechism," and in the highest divisions, the catechism of perseverance. (Memoir of 1886, pp. 24-30.)

Reading constituted a fifth division, and it is only necessary to open the prescribed text books, to find such extracts as the following, about Saint Helen :—

"Our Lord then showed His love for her, by letting her find the true Cross on which He had shed His blood. The sick were cured when they touched the cross.

Saint Helen had a large church built, and in it she placed the cross." (Sadlier's Dominion Catholic First Reader, Part II, p. 58) ; or this from Wilfred's journey with the Angel :—

"Other lands were dotted with ancient Christian churches, but without proper altars ; and with no Blessed Sacrament, no Mass, no pictures of the Mother of Jesus ; and Wilfred thought, but he was not sure, that the angel was more sorrowful over these lands, than over those without churches." (Sadlier's Dom. Third Reader p. 139.) Or, in other words, all denominations outside of the Roman Catholic Church are less acceptable to God than the heathen. I might multiply instances to show how the author of these readers has carried out the statement in his preface to the third reader that "religious instruction and mental training should now progress hand in hand."

Grammar, a sixth division, affords opportunities which are frequently taken advantage of in the examinations for analyzing and parsing sacred passages, and in one instance the pupils are called upon to correct a sentence referring to the color of the silk stockings worn by cardinals. (Minute Books, No. 1, pp. 180, 183, 189, 193, 225 No. 2 p. 76, 119.)

The subjects set for composition include a letter to his parents by a child who is preparing for his first communion and the following interesting subject :—

“The Priesthood—show the grandeur of the priest and the benefits which he confers.” (Minute Book No. 2, pp. 78, 144.)

Arithmetic, Algebra and Geography afford little opportunity for the introduction of religious teaching otherwise those branches also would have been put to a similar use. Indeed it seems to have been necessary to prescribe treatises on Arithmetic and Algebra prepared under the supervision of the “Freres de la Doctrine Chretienne.”

What with priests, ecclesiastics, and sisters of charity certificated by the late Archbishop after some alleged but mysterious private examination, with priests for inspectors, crucifixes in the schools, and dogma injected into almost every subject on the programme of studies, the pupils of the schools of the Roman Catholic section were well provided with religious instruction.

CHAPTER III.

BAD FEATURES OF THE OLD SYSTEM.

The three most noticeable features of the system just outlined would seem to have been :—

1. Its thorough inefficiency from an educational point of view.
2. The absolute control exercised by the Roman Catholic priesthood, and the complete immersion of the pupil in Roman Catholic ideas and influences.
3. The existence and development of French ideas and aspirations to the almost entire exclusion of those that are British.

L.—INEFFICIENCY OF THE SCHOOLS.

The complete inefficiency of the system cannot better be shewn than by adducing in evidence the questions contained in examination papers set for teachers certificates. The following is a translation of an examination paper set for first class Roman Catholic teachers in 1885 :—

CATHOLIC SECTION OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION—EXAMINATION OF TEACHERS.

First-Class Certificate.

EXAMINERS { Rev. J. Messier, Priest,
 { M. J. Prendergast, Barrister.

CATECHISM.—

1. What is the Church ? Where is the true Church ?
Ought one to believe what the Catholic Church teaches us ?
And why ?
2. What is the Eucharist ? What is it necessary to do to receive with benefit this great sacrament ?
3. What is sanctifying grace ? How is it lost ?
4. Name and define the theological virtues.

COMPORTMENT.—

1. How is a letter addressed, when written, to a prelate, to a priest, to a professional man ? How are such letters concluded ?
2. In conversation, what titles do you employ in speaking to these same persons ?

HISTORY.—

1. Describe the defeat of the American armies near Chateauguay?

2. Who was Saint Thomas Becket? What difficulty had he with Henry II? How did he die? What was the fate of Marie Stuart? Write a short note on the treaty of Paris. Who was then Governor of Canada?

GEOGRAPHY.—

What is the capital of England? Name its principal cities. Where is Egypt situated? What is the object of geology? What are terrain d'alluvion, terrain de sediment?

PÉDAGOGY.—

Demonstrate the importance of developing judgment among children. How can that faculty be exercised?

The original of the above paper, and of several others even more absurd, will be found in the "Memoir" prepared by the Catholic section of the Board of Education, and sent to the Colonial Exhibition at London in 1886.

The above is not given as a complete set of papers to be written on for a first-class certificate. A complete set is presented in appendix B, where it is noted that the first-class papers were the same for 1880 and 1881, excepting the grammar paper, and that in 1882 a great many of the same questions were used over again. It would be easy to produce very many of the examination papers from the minutes of the Catholic section even more ridiculous than the one here reproduced, but a better idea of the ludicrous inefficiency of the schools and their teachers can best be shown by quoting the questions on individual subjects set on the examinations of teachers in the various years.

The above paper contained all the questions asked for a first-class certificate in 1885, in catechism, comportment, history, geography and pedagogy. Agriculture is an important subject in a growing western country. The following is a complete list of the questions asked candidates for first and second class teachers in agriculture in the years 1880, 1881, 1882 and 1886:—

1880 — AGRICULTURE.

First Class.

Explain the practice of drainage. How are turnips cultivated?

Second Class.

How do you make hot beds? How do you cultivate Indian corn, turnips and melons?

1881.—AGRICULTURE.

First Class.

The same as 1880.

Second Class.

How do you cultivate the onion, radishes, lettuce, and cucumbers?

1882.—AGRICULTURE.

First Class.

How are cabbages and melons cultivated?

Second Class.

What are the principal conditions to be observed in the cultivation of a garden?

What kind of manure is best suited for gardening purposes?

1886.—AGRICULTURE.

First Class.

How do you cultivate lettuce, potatoes and celery?

What is the advantage in plants sown in the open ground over those sown in hot beds?

Second Class.

How are hot beds made, and what are the advantages of them?

HISTORY.

Few subjects are more important than history, and yet the following are the only papers set on history for third and fourth class certificates in their respective years :—

1880.—HISTORY.

Third Class.

Describe the death of Abel, then the deluge, as you would describe it to children (Minute book No. 1, 151.)

Fourth Class.

Recount the history of David and the persecution of Antiochus as if you were relating it to children. (Ib., 152.)

1881.—HISTORY.

Third Class.

Relate the history of Joseph and of holy Job in the manner suited to children. (Ib., 195.)

Fourth Class.

Why were Adam and Eve banished from Paradise?

Relate the history of Abraham. (Ib., 199.)

1882.—HISTORY.

Third Class.

Relate the history of the Maccabees.

What are the books which contain the history of the New Testament? (Ib., 228.)

Fourth Class.

Relate the history of holy Job and that of Tobias. (Ib., 226.)

1883.—HISTORY.

Third Class.

What was the issue of the hatred of Esau against Jacob? And how did the latter re-enter into favor with his brother? When and how did God give his law to the Hebrews? What did Jesus do on the eve of His passion? (Ib., 260.)

Fourth Class.

How did God save Noah from the deluge, and what did Noah do after the deluge? What enterprise did the descendants of Noah enter upon before dispersing into all parts of the earth? (Ib., 261.)

1884.—HISTORY.

Third Class.

Tell who Solomon was, and what was the greatest enterprise which he accomplished?

Who was the first king of the people of God, and what was his conduct on the throne? What are the principal miracles of Jesus Christ. (Ib., 311.)

Fourth Class.

Who were the children of Adam and of Noah?

What notable changes may be remarked in the second epoch of the New Testament? (Ib., 312.)

1885.—HISTORY.

Third Class.

Recount—First, the history of Joseph, second, the contest of David against Goliath.

What are the principal parables of the New Testament?

What were the words of Jesus Christ on the cross. (Minute book No. 2, p. 28.)

Fourth Class.

What are the principal writings of the New Testament? Describe the creation of man. State what Holy Writ tells us about Cain and Abel.

What grand enterprise did the descendants of Noah conceive before their dispersion, and how did God compel them to give up their project? (Ib., 29.)

So much for agriculture and history. Many of the questions in geography, arithmetic and the other subjects will, on examination, be found to be quite as useless educationally, if not as ridiculous, as many that I have cited. Here are a few in decorum :—

DECORUM.

1880.—

First Class.

What are the titles attached to the principal dignitaries, ecclesiastical and civil?

How should one conduct oneself on a visit to Bishops or Governors?

1881.—

First Class.

Same as 1880.

Second Class.

How should a child behave in the presence of the Cure or of the Bishop?

1887.—

Second Class.

Give a resume of the principal duties of a person when he is at table.

What are the circumstances which require that one should make calls?

The above questions are taken at random ; and many more of equal inutility from an educational point of view might be quoted.

Surely no further evidence is necessary to show that the education alleged to be furnished in the schools of the Roman Catholic section was farcical to the last degree, a wretched travesty of what education ought to be, and a disgrace to the Province of Manitoba.

RESULTING ILLITERACY.

Illiteracy amongst the French half-breeds in Manitoba under such circumstances need surprise nobody. That inability to read or write does prevail to an enormous extent amongst them as compared with the other inhabitants of the Province has long been notorious. Every business man who has dealings with them is thoroughly familiar with the fact. Every municipal officer knows it. A glance at the records in the courts, the registry offices, the church registers, or any other document or files of a public or quasi public nature will reveal it. The comparative uselessness of post offices in French half-breed districts is not due to diffidence, but to the prevailing illiteracy.

The petitions sent in from time to time to the Legislature are perhaps the most convenient to refer to in this connection. A petition presented on April 18th, 1888, by 327 Icelanders, bears 327 signatures and not a single mark. One presented in May of the previous year by people of the same nationality bears 98 signatures and no marks. On May 3rd, 1892, the Mennonite settlement of Steinbach, east of Red River, petitioned for aid to a Railway Company. Of the 95 names on the petition, all signed personally, and none by mark. At the same time the settlement of Clear Springs presented a similar petition. Of the 49 Mennonites on this petition, all signed personally, and none by mark. Contrast the above with the following petitions, which are on file in the proper departments of the Manitoba Government :—

Petition from Municipality of Montcalm re destruction of diseased animals. 7 names on petition (all French.) 3 sign by mark.

Petition of residents in St. Vital re placing certain River Lots in Municipality of Cartier. 22 names on petition (all French or Half-breeds) 10 sign by mark.

Petition asking that Grande Pointe Settlement be declared part of the Municipality of Tache. 12 names on petition (all French or Half-breeds). 5 sign by mark.

Petition re change in Boundaries of Elm River Municipality. 28 names on petition (4 English, 24 French or Half-breeds.) English all sign their names. 18 French or Half-breeds sign by mark.

Petition for bridge over Turtle River. 54 names on petition (French and Half-breeds). 24 out of 27 half-breeds sign by mark.

Add to these the well authenticated case of a petition presented to the Legislature by the reeve and councillors of a municipality, one of whom signed his name, while five signed by mark.

Such facts speak for themselves and require no comment. Mr. Ewart asks, "Why does the partial illiteracy of half-breeds, who during their present generation were roving bands of hunters, and whose mother tongue is Cree, prove anything against the Catholic schools in Manitoba?" It seems to me that Mr. Ewart's excuse must fail to account for the illiteracy to which he refers. Quebec has certainly passed the nomadic stage and yet what we complain of in Manitoba is the same state of illiteracy which has always disgraced Quebec and which still exists there despite centuries of civilization. Nor will the nomadic theory explain the illiteracy of Spain, Portugal, Italy and many other countries which passed the nomadic stage very long ago. Besides it is well to remember that the Roman Catholic church has boasted educational establishments in Manitoba for many generations. From the Memoir to which reference has been frequently made, it appears that St. Boniface College was founded in the year 1818. The Sisters of Charity had a school of 105 boys and girls at St. Boniface on the 25th of August, 1845. The school of St. Francois Xavier was established in 1850, the academy of St. Norbert in 1859 and the school of Saint Vital in 1860. One of the above petitions emanated from St. Vital and another from the vicinity of St. Norbert. The difficulty is not that the Roman Catholic church does not provide educational institutions; it is rather that its educational institutions do not educate the people under its charge. It is a peculiarity common to countries where the Roman Catholic religion prevails, and one which a nomadic theory will not account for.

II. ROMANIZING THE SCHOOLS.

I have said that a second feature of the schools was the absolute control exercised by the Roman Catholic priesthood and the complete immersion of the pupil in Roman Catholic ideas and influences.

The following are a few instances of the questions set Roman Catholic candidates for teachers' certificates in 1885 :—

What is the Church? Where is the true Church? Ought we to believe what the Catholic Church teaches us? And why?

What is the mass? What must be done to properly understand it?

What sentiments ought we to entertain towards our Guardian Angel?

What are the principal mysteries of our religion?

Describe the fall—(a) of the angels, (b) of the first man.

What is meant by indulgences? What must be done in order to obtain them?

Here are others :—

1883.—Are we in communion with the Saints in Heaven, and the souls in Purgatory, and how?

1884.—What is the rosary?

What is the angelic salutation?

1886.—What must we do before, during, after confession to receive the sacrament of penitence beneficially.

1887.—In an assembly of prelates and theologians where could one find infallibility—in the Pope advising alone, or in the majority of the bishops? Give the reasons for your answer.

I pass over the following :—

What are angels?

What are the occupations of the angels?

What do you mean by devils?

Anyone who could answer the second question at any rate would deserve to be senior wrangler and double first in any hall of learning.

I now come to a class of questions asked only too frequently in the schools of the Roman Catholic section from which it will appear that for years in this Province we were in the habit of subsidizing schools where the children were taught not only that Roman Catholicism was true but that all other religions were false. I will instance several :—

1883 :—What are the marks of the *True Church*, and define them?

1882.—What is the Church, and who are those who do not belong to it?

1884.—What does the sign of the cross represent to us ; and how is it the mark of a christian ?

1887.—State and explain the qualities of the true church.

State then what are their characteristics. Prove that the Roman Church is the only true Catholic Church.

How ought we to understand this proposition :—outside of the *Church* no salvation ?

The answer to the last two questions will be found in the following from page 17 of the authorized text book, Butler's Catechism :—

Q. How are we known to be christians ?

A. By being baptized, by professing the doctrine of Christ, and by the sign of the cross.

Q. Where are true christians to be found ?

A. Only in the true church.

Q. How do you call the true church ?

A. *The Holy Catholic Church.* Ap. Cr.

Q. Is there any other church besides the *Holy Catholic Church* ?

A. No ; as there is but *one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God*, and *Father of all*, there is but one true church. Eph. 4.

Is it any wonder that the Roman Catholic church should desire to perpetuate a system, which however little it may benefit education, does more than anything else can do in inculcating Roman Catholicism, pure and simple, with all its creeds, formularies and observances ; which teaches not only that the Roman Catholic church is the true church, but that all others are false and damnable.

III. THEIR ANTI-BRITISH TENDENCIES.

The third feature of the schools of the Roman Catholic section, and the most serious one from a national point of view, was the existence and fostering there of French ideas and aspirations to the almost entire exclusion of those that are British.

The teachers were in the main, not only [Roman Catholic but French. The inspectors, as their names indicate, were nearly all French. French was the language of the schools. English was practically a *langue etrangere*—a foreign tongue. Under the regulations of Aug. 10th, 1879, it was provided that the language spoken by the majority of the ratepayers of a school district should be that taught in the school, and that teachers should have a right to an increase of salary when required to teach *une autre langue*. No teacher in a French school could be required to teach English,

and no teacher in an English school could be required to teach French unless the children were furnished with the books prescribed by the Roman Catholic section, nor unless they were able to read in the language of the district when that language is their mother tongue. In any case the trustees were required to communicate with the council before introducing into a school *une langue etrangere* to the majority of the ratepayers of the district. (Minute Book No. 1 p. p. 78 and 80.)

These regulations could not but have the effect of excluding the study of English from the schools where the French were in the majority; and they were in the majority in nearly all the schools in the Roman Catholic section. In the almost complete absence of English teachers and the English language, and surrounded on all sides by French influences, the pupils of the Roman Catholic schools were doomed to grow up in ignorance of British history and tradition and all that pertains to the genius of British institutions and to a British Canadian nationality. History alone could be relied upon to rescue them from the ignorance which was a necessary result of their condition. But, as I have pointed out before, history in the second, third and fourth divisions was confined to the *Old* and *New* Testaments. True, Canadian history was one of the subjects on the programme in the fifth division, but only the history of Canada under the French regime. British Canadian history could not be learned till the sixth division was reached and English history was reserved for the seventh. But comparatively few French pupils ever reached these divisions. For instance out of the 48 schools that reported in 1886 only seven contained pupils in the sixth or seventh divisions, and of these only three boasted pupils in the seventh division. The total number in the seventh division in the 48 schools was 14. In 1888 sixty school reports show but ten schools with pupils in the sixth or seventh divisions, and a total of 13 pupils in the seventh division in the 60 schools. In 1889 ninety-three reports show pupils attending these divisions in but eleven schools, and a total of 22 pupils in the seventh division in the 93 schools. Outside of Winnipeg and St. Boniface there were but four pupils reported in the seventh division in the 93 reports to which I refer, consequently British Canadian history and institutions and English history remained unknown to the mass of children in the Roman Catholic schools. Those who knew anything of them gained their knowledge through authors

friendly neither to England nor to British institutions in Canada. The prescribed text books in history appear from the Memoir of 1886 (p. 6) to have been "Histoire sainte et du Canada, histoire de France histoire d'Angleterre (Drioux), Sacred History, History of Canada, History of England, (Lingard), Ancient and Modern History, Dom. series ; Sadlier."

A history of Canada published by "Les Freres des Ecoles Chretiennes" and stamped with the approval of the Archbishop of Quebec seems to have been the one most generally in use. It could hardly be expected that a history of the kind, written from the French stand point and dealing largely with the struggles between the French and English in Canada would be over friendly to the latter. Accordingly we read that the conduct of the English Americans towards the Acadians was "unworthy of civilized nations" (p. 53) and that "they wished by such unworthy treatment to punish the Acadians both because of their attachment to France, their mother country, and because of their inviolable fidelity to the Catholic religion" (p. 54).

Towards Sir James Craig "Mgr Plessis evinced such firmness that the Governor judged it prudent not to undertake anything opposed to the religious administration of the country" (p. 73). When Count Dalhousie arrived as Governor in 1820 England "convinced finally of the impossibility of Protestantising the country, assumed the rôle of allowing the Canadians to follow the religion of their fathers" (p. 79). Lord Gosford came to Canada in 1835 to examine into the affairs of the country and make a full report. This history tells us that "Lord Gosford made, consequently, a long report quite hostile to the Canadians and which for that very reason was approved of by the House of Commons and the Ministers in England" (p. 83).

Of the policy suggested by Lord Durham and which led to the union of the Canadas we are told :—"It was the same which had given the constitution of 1791, that is to say, the anglicising of the French-Canadians and the destruction of the Roman Catholic religion" (p. 85), and so on. This history written by the Freres des Ecoles Chretienne" and approved by the Archbishop of Quebec can safely be described as being French in its sympathies throughout and anti-British under all circumstances.

The following were the questions in Canadian history set for second class certificats in 1883 :—

"Who were the first missionaries who announced the Gospel on the banks of the St. Lawrence ?

Name the first Jesuits who came to Canada and specify the year of their arrival. Describe the battle of Carillon. (Minute Book No. 1, p. 259).

The first two are evidently asked in the interests of the Roman Catholic church. The answer to the last is found on page 56 of the prescribed history where we are told that on the 8th of July 1759 Montcalm with 3,600 men defeated 16,000 English under the command of Abercrombie at Carillon.

As to English history, instruction in that branch, seems to have been regarded as a farce. A perusal of the examination papers set for first class certificates will show that the questions set in history were exactly the same in 1880, 1881, and 1882. Those of 1884 were the same as those of 1883. The only question asked in English history as distinct from Canadian history, for first class certificates in 1880, 1881 and 1882 was :—"Relate the conquest of England by William of Normandy." The only question relating to English history in 1883 and 1884 was "Describe the establishment of christianity in England." The questions in 1885 sufficiently indicate the bent of the examiners :—

"Who was St. Thomas Becket ? What difficulty had he with Henry II ? How did he die ? What was the fate of Mary Stuart ?

In 1887 the candidates are again asked to explain the conquest of England by the Normans. They are also to describe the causes of the schism in England and to give their views on "the reign of Elizabeth and the role of Cromwell."

The answers to all of these questions would require to be given according to Lingard, the Roman Catholic historian of England, or M. L'Abbe Drioux the French historian, and the selection of questions to be answered indicates a desire on the part of the examiners to concentrate the attention of the candidates upon the religious quarrels and differences of English history, and to fan into perpetual flames the embers of religious and race discord.

Such were the methods by which, under the separate school system, Manitoba sought to provide herself with intelligent and patriotic Catholic citizens. So far as intelligence is concerned, it can surprise no one to find that in the separate schools it found but little stimulus. How any one under training of the kind

could ever come in contact with the idea of state as against church sovereignty in civil matters it is hard to conceive. In what way the germ of any patriotism, but that which looks to France, could develop in such an atmosphere can scarcely be conjectured.

CHAPTER IV.

DISTRIBUTION OF LEGISLATIVE GRANT UNDER THE DUAL SYSTEM.

The control exercised by the Roman Catholic church over every portion of the educational system of the Roman Catholic section, whatever it may have been in theory, was absolute in practice. As was at one time stated on the floor of the Provincial Legislature, they controlled their section of the Board of Education for the reason that a large majority of its members consisted of clergymen of the Roman Catholic church. They controlled the inspectors because every inspector was a Roman Catholic priest. They controlled the normal schools which are supported to instruct those who go out to teach, from the fact that the normal schools under the Roman Catholic section were conducted altogether by sisters of their religious institutions, either in Winnipeg or St. Boniface, and those sisters were directly under the control of the church.

The Government of the Province had little or nothing to say with regard to the conduct of the schools of the Roman Catholic section. It handed over the educational grant at stated periods but even in that it merely obeyed the law ; with the distribution of the grant it had nothing to do. The church managed the Roman Catholic section, and disposed of the public money granted to that section as it saw fit. The public at large had about as much control over the expenditure as it had over the Roman Catholic church funds or the private purse of Archbishop Langevin. The same church practically controlled municipal taxation for school purposes in the various school districts of its section. In October, 1883, the superintendent of Catholic schools formally protested against an act incorporating the City of Emerson because two of the sections empowered the council to issue debentures to raise money for school purposes, and pointed out that by clauses 25 and 26 of the existing school law "the powers vested in the municipal councils, to levy and collect taxes for school purposes in certain cases, cannot be exercised by them unless required to do so by the board of trustees, thus clearly making the municipal organization in so much as it relates to school matters but a machinery to fulfil the requirements of the school organization" (Report of Superintendent of Catholic Schools. 1883, p. 20) and,—he might have added—the trustees of the Roman Catholic districts are in all cases "but a machinery

to fulfil the requirements" of the proper Roman Catholic ecclesiastical authority. So far as Roman Catholic public school education was concerned the Province relegated to the church of that denomination for nearly a fifth of a century, (1871-1890), the administration of a very large portion of the public moneys and all power of levying taxes for the support of Roman Catholic public schools. I do not say that it did so in theory, but that such was the result of the system.

That such a state of things was wrong in principle it would be idle to deny. It is not necessary at this day to argue in favor of the complete separation of church and state. But, apart from the objection on the ground of principle, it is very natural to suppose that if any corporation, ecclesiastical or other, be given the choice of raising money for educational purposes by employing the public grant or by taxing its adherents, it will utilize the public grant as much as possible and spare its adherents in the same proportion. One of the charges against the system abolished by the acts of 1890 was that it led to just such results. While the Roman Catholics insisted upon remaining apart from the rest of the community and despised all other religions, they did not, it was said, show a like anxiety to keep aloof from the public chest.

ANALYSIS OF GRANT.

The following is an analysis showing how the legislative grant was distributed between the two sections in 1889, the last year under the old system :

Amount of grant.....	\$120,000 00
<i>School Population.</i>	
Protestant.....	18,850
Roman Catholic.....	4,364
	<hr/>
	23,214
<i>School Districts.</i>	
Protestant.....	534
Catholic.....	73
<i>Teachers Employed.</i>	
Protestant.....	668
Roman Catholic.....	96
<i>Division of Grant.</i>	
Protestants received.....	\$97,790.00
Roman Catholics received.....	22,210.00

Average per District.

Protestant districts (534)	178.04
Roman Catholic (73)	304.24

Or, if the cost of administration should be deducted to arrive at the distribution of the net grant, the figures are as follows:

Grant to Protestant section	\$97,790.00
Less cost of administration	23,043.86
Net grant	\$74,746.14
Grant to Roman Catholic section	22,210.00
Less cost of administration	5,680.00
Net grant	\$16,530.00

Or average per district.

Protestant districts each received (534)	\$ 142.65
Roman Catholic " " " (73)	226.44

Or average per teacher employed.

Protestant teachers, each (668)	\$111.89
Roman Catholic teachers, each (96)	172.19

The following are instances showing how this unfair distribution worked out in practice:—

<i>Catholics.</i>	Children.	Teachers.	Amt. of Grant.
St. Boniface North	12	1	\$207 70
" South	39	1	225 85
" West	52	1	238 70
Gauthier	44	1	224 85
St. Leon Village	66	1	256 70
Selkirk	52	1	186 35
<i>Protestants.</i>	265		\$1340 15
Headingley	59	1	\$134 70
West Kildonan	78	1	133 20
East Kildonan	51	1	130 15
St. James	51	1	131 35
Crystal City	69	1	138 40
McGregor	84	1	135 00
	392		\$ 802.00

Or the six Catholic schools with 265 children and six teachers got \$1340.15 or \$225.00 per school.

And the six Protestant schools with 392 children and six teachers got \$802.00 or \$133.80 per school.

ANALYSIS OF TAXATION.

The following is an analysis of the taxation for the same year :

The Protestants raised altogether	\$282,204.00
The Roman Catholics raised altogether....	17,711.31
Or average per district,	
Protestants raised.....	\$ 538.56
Roman Catholics raised.....	242.62
Or average per teacher,	
Protestants raised.....	\$ 422.46
Roman Catholics raised	184.49

SUMMARY.

The Roman Catholics taxed themselves on the average per district.....	\$ 538.56
And received from the Government but.....	178.04
While the Roman Catholics taxed themselves on the average only	\$ 242.62
And received from the Government.....	304.24

In the course of the first debate in the Provincial Legislature on the School Acts of 1890 a similar analysis of the grant and taxation for the year 1888 was made. I have selected the year 1889 because it was the last year under the old system.

The Rev. Father Cherrier in a sermon preached in Winnipeg in the month of March last contended that the basis of comparison adopted in the analysis for 1888 which was the same as that just adopted for 1889 as unfair. He gave figures to show that if the distribution of the grant had been made on the basis of the total average attendance at the schools of the two sections for the year the Roman Catholics received less than the Protestants during the same period. "As an instance of this," he said, "in 1888 there were 495 Protestant school districts in operation in the Province, with an average total attendance of 9,856 or 19.91 per district, as against 64 Catholic districts equally in operation, with an average total attendance of 3,648 or 57 per district. Such being the case, who could reasonably deny that a school district with an average attendance of 57, should according to the fair apportionment of the legislative grant on a basis of attendance, receive almost three times as much as another school district that has only 19.91. Now let us apply the principle to Mr. Turk's figures and we shall readily understand that the giving of \$347.03 to a school district that has an average attendance of 57 is no more than the granting of \$121.76 only for another school district with but 19.91 of an average attendance."

There are several answers to Rev. Father Cherriers' argument. In the first place the legislative grant was not distributed on the basis of average attendance but on a basis of school population. If the grant had been distributed on a basis of attendance solely, the simplest arithmetical calculation must show that a school district with an average attendance of 57 should, as he says, receive almost three times as much as another district with an attendance of 19.91. But what could be more unfair than this very distribution which the Rev. Father Cherrier seeks to justify? The three schools with an average attendance each of 19.91 would cost three times as much as the one Roman Catholic school with the attendance of 57. Three school houses would be necessary, with three teachers, three supplies of furniture, fuel and school machinery. And yet we are calmly told that the one school should properly receive as much as the other three. The contention becomes even more ridiculous when it is considered that the Roman Catholic teachers were much less expensive than the teachers of the schools belonging to the other section of the board. On this point the Rev. Father Cherrier said in the course of the same sermon.

"Now everybody knows and some of our local Protestant dignitaries have repeatedly acknowledged that their teachers and professors are unable to cope with our religious orders as to salaries. They are content as a rule with very little more than the food and the raiment whilst it is absolutely impossible to expect the same from laymen many of whom are married or actually engaged in a professional pursuit." In reference to the same thing the late Archbishop Tache in a letter to the Manitoba Free Press on September 5th, 1889, said:—"The advantage I allude to is the one secured by the valuable services of persons who do not teach for the sake of money or for making a living out of it, but who do teach as a sacred duty to God and society and who teach either for nothing or for the small amount barely giving them food and clothing." It should therefore, on Rev. Father Cherrier's own showing, cost much less to support a Roman Catholic school than one that is not Roman Catholic, and yet he serenely argues that just such a school should receive three times the grant allotted to a school which is not Roman Catholic, and is conducted at greater cost to its supporters.

This plausible but most misleading argument of Rev. Father Cherrier's is valuable nevertheless. It shows beyond all doubt that to distribute the legislative grant on a basis of school attendance would be in the last degree unfair and absurd.

A distribution on the basis of school population must also result unfairly, especially when worked out as it was in the Roman Catholic schools under the laws repealed by the statutes of 1890. The reasons why the Roman Catholic schools were able to appropriate so much larger a proportion of the legislative grant than was received by the schools of the other section are easily arrived at. They entirely failed to grapple with the question of education as it presented itself in this Province. Their schools were for the most part planted in thickly settled districts where a large school population would entitle them to a heavy legislative grant. They appear to have determined to confine their operations to the populous portions of the Province where a large grant would relieve them of the necessity of submitting to a heavy municipal tax for the support of their schools. The object seems to have been to escape taxation and to depend so much as possible on the legislative grant,—to avoid individual effort, and live upon the public purse. Whether the schools were conducted with this end in view or not, the figures given show what the result was in practice. If there were in 1888, 495 Protestant school districts in operation in the Province with an average attendance of 19.91 per district while the 64 Roman Catholic districts averaged 57 per district, the difference is that the Protestant section of the school board lost no opportunity to advance education in the Province, rearing school houses wherever the pioneers of settlement pushed their way, while the efforts of the Roman Catholic section were in a great degree concentrated upon the populous settlements where fat legislative grants and light school taxes went hand in hand.

INEFFICIENCY OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

Facsimile of a return made by a Roman Catholic teacher.

1st	Catechism
2nd	Religion
3rd	The Golden Primer
4th	Writing and Reading
5th	Spelling
6th	Arithmetic
7th	Geography and History

Total

8

Michael Ruby

Teacher

2nd day of July

1889

CHAPTER V.

PRACTICAL DIFFICULTIES WHICH MAKE A DUAL SYSTEM IM- POSSIBLE.

It will be remembered that in reply to the remedial order the Legislature of Manitoba pointed out that, apart from objections upon principle, there are serious objections from a practical educational standpoint to any legislation restoring one or more sets of separate schools. An efficient system of primary education is maintained with great difficulty in Manitoba. Settlement is sparse. Our small population amounting in all to not more than 200,000 is scattered over the whole face of the Province, some 74,000 square miles in extent. As an immense area of land is by Dominion enactment exempt from Provincial taxation the school taxes are very burdensome upon those who have to contribute their proportion.

Under the circumstances the difficulty of establishing two boards of education with duplicate school houses, teachers, and school machinery must be obvious. In newly settled portions of the Province to organize a single set of schools is difficult enough. Any other arrangement would be impossible. A diagram will help to make this very clear. The following diagram shows the ordinary Manitoba township six miles square divided into its thirty-six sections, each a mile square in area. Each section is divided into four quarter sections of 160 acres. The shaded portions represent sections or parts of sections not open to homestead entry, being reserved for railways, the Hudson's Bay Company and the school endowment. It will be seen that more than half of the available territory of a township is withheld from the homesteader and reserved for the purposes referred to.

A MANITOBA TOWNSHIP.

31	32	33	34	35	36
30	29	28	27	26	25
19	20	21	22	23	24
18	17	16	15	14	13
7	6	5	10	11	12
8	5	4	3	2	1

Eventually, of course, these lands like the rest must come under occupation, but in the meantime, during the early stages of settlement, it is easy to realize the chill and dead weight which so many inert areas must impose upon a sparse and scattered community. Winter roads, bridges, churches and schools are all made cruelly difficult to the settler by reason of this unfortunate isolation. It is easy to imagine the difficulties and positive discomforts of sixty families distributed over thirty-six square miles, the area of a Manitoba township, as against the condition of eighty or one hundred and twenty families within the same extent of territory, and yet forty heads of families is above the average. The difficulty in organizing schools where the sections available for homestead entry are in so many instances three, four, and more miles apart as in the above diagram is too apparent to require further explanation. An easy load for two men may break the back of one.

To add to the difficulty the exemptions from taxation in many municipalities only help to place greater burdens on the backs of the homesteaders. The following figures collected in 1888 will help to give some idea of the amount annually lost to the settler by the exemption—by the Dominion, not by the Province—from taxation of the Canadian Pacific Railway, the Canada North-West Land Company, and the Manitoba North-Western and Manitoba South-Western railways alone :—

LANDS EXEMPT.

Municipality.	C. P. R.	C. N. W. L. Co.	M.&N.W	M.&S.W.
	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.	Acres.
Archie	25,600	19,360		
Boulton			51,360	
Blanchard	12,960			
Birtle			11,840	
Brenda		115,840		
Clanwilliam			26,880	
Cartwright				78,400
Daly	23,900	2,240		
Deloraine				92,160
Elm River	18,732	32,960		
Glendale	5,440	3,520		
Lansdowne			46,800	
Miniota	11,520	11,680		
Medora				620,800
New Cypress		26,720		
Oakland	9,920	8,860		
Odanah	10,080	6,560		
Osprey	19,840	3,200	960	
Pipestone		51,840		
Riverside	9,760	58,320		16,360
Rosburn			64,000	
Russell			14,080	
Silver Creek			25,280	
South Cypress		38,560		
Shoal Lake	21,760			
Shell River			18,240	
Strathclair			20,080	
Turtle Mountain				78,160
Woodlands	46,793			
Woodworth	23,320	20,160		
Whitehead	21,760			
Whitewater		18,080		55,200

Add to the burdens imposed by reserving lands from the homesteader and by exemption from taxation, the heavy debenture debt of the municipalities of a young Province in which railways and other enterprises have been bonused all too freely, and it will be easily seen that we are in no way to bear the expenses incident to organizing a double system of schools with two administrative boards and all the useless and expensive paraphernalia of the old system.

Indeed, owing to the scattered distribution of settlement and the other causes referred to, it must be conceded that it would be

the height of folly to attempt to again organize a dual system of schools. During the last session of the Manitoba Legislature a return was made to an order of the House shewing the names of all school districts wherein the number of pupils attending school during the years 1893 and 1894 was less than ten, and indicating what such average attendance was in each such school. The facts and figures contained in the return are so startling and afford such an eloquent and unanswerable argument to those who would foist separate schools upon Manitoba in addition to those already existing, that it is worth while giving the return for 1894 in detail. It is as follows :—

1894.

<i>School District.</i>	<i>Average Attendance.</i>	<i>School District.</i>	<i>Average Attendance</i>
Woodlands	9.77	Millerway	9.68
Ossowo	5.48	Norquay	9.80
Oakland	8.22	Newanlage.....	7.01
Ashland	7.23	Petrel..	9.56
Whitehaven	6.57	Rugby..	7.51
Silver Creek.....	9.15	Rosedale.....	9.39
West Oakland	7.09	Ralphton	6.52
Marquette	9.41	Rose Ridge	7.79
Argyle.....	5.33	Stodgell.....	7.59
Little Saskatchewan...	7.00	Bethel	9.99
Lansdowne	8.87	Iroquois	6.47
Albion	9.56	Wheatland	9.17
Albert.....	8.04	Wolseley	9.21
Armour	7.82	Woodbay	9.84
Burdette	8.34	Willowdale.....	9.21
Beatrice	6.10	Hebron.....	9.73
Bow Park.....	6.08	Ethel.....	8.80
Beresford	7.39	Riverdale.....	9.10
Blenheim.....	8.77	Pembina Crossing.....	6.83
Currier's Landing	7.38	Pelican Lake.....	7.64
Crown	7.24	Two Creeks	8.77
Dumfries	8.63	Rose Valley	7.01
Foster	9.41	Swaffham	9.88
Florence	6.39	Rothsay	2.49
Hazelwood.....	5.77	De Clare	9.36
Lyonshall	7.52	Eton.....	8.40
Langvale.....	9.70	Montefiore.....	8.67
Lilyfield	8.57	Sandhurst.....	8.33
McDonald.....	8.23	Gorrie	6.59
McLeod.....	7.76	Bradley	5.07
Mowbray	9.29	Belton	7.62
Mount Prospect.....	9.53	Daybreak	8.92

CONTINUED.

<i>School District.</i>	<i>Average Attendance.</i>	<i>School District.</i>	<i>Average Attendance.</i>
Mountjoy	8.92	St. Luke	3.93
Alcester	9.49	Glendenning	7.25
Bunclody	9.55	Charleston	7.59
Erin	7.20	Fairford	8.54
Hilton	9.38	Franklin	9.87
Northcote	8.47	Woodlea	8.03
Graham	8.68	Verity	9.61
Soudan	7.56	Plainville	5.38
Medina	7.99	Springbrook	0.25
Chesterfield	5.24	Boulton	8.14
Verona	5.35	Hunter	7.63
Star Mound	9.92	Preston	8.26
Erinview	7.93	Lambton	7.49
Royal	6.20	Kelloe	5.49
Ashfield	4.04	Chalton	6.49
Aweme	7.00	White Bank Lea	3.83
Ravenswood	6.23	Kola	7.31
Meridian	8.52	Buckingham	8.78
Saunderson	7.29	Jacques	4.98
Addington	8.95	Tobarmore	4.19
Victoria Lake	9.54	Boyne Creek	9.39
Weir	8.05	Boyne Creek	4.68
Carlingville	8.62	Valley	7.20
Lily Bay	6.60	Brown	9.49
Ellice	7.73	Hillview	7.93
Rowland	9.25	Wapaha	8.18
Whitefield	8.93	Makepeace	6.58
Hargrave	6.97	Norwood	8.39
Fern's Hollow	9.20	Rosebud	9.25
Burns	9.30	St. Lawrence	7.69
Ferndale	6.20	Spring Valley	5.94
Isbister	8.91	Maplewood	5.74
Tremaine	5.00	Valley View	4.32
Portage Creek	6.44	Delta	8.21
North Derby	4.92	Prestwick	5.79
North Antler	9.83	Lothair	8.40
Stephenfield	8.42	Purple Bank	4.45
Suthwyn	7.67	Poplar Grove	8.65
Mimosa	5.41	Ravens Glen	9.90
Wakefield	8.62	Barley	7.46
Stuartburn	6.22	Roseneath	7.62
Centre	7.43	Lenore	8.88
Poplar Park	6.43	Elva	5.79
Crewe	5.61	Gourlays	7.03
Plum Hollow	6.80	Mount Vernon	6.02
West Hall	9.09	Grosse Isle	6.75

CONTINUED.


<i>School District.</i>	<i>Average Attendance.</i>	<i>School District.</i>	<i>Average Attendance.</i>
Kingswood	5.44	Bonnie Doon	5.26
Robert Burns	5.40	Bear Creek	4.77
Dale	9.39	Ivanhoe	7.65
Tremblay	7.42	Nakeham	5.62
Myrtle	8.56	Gerrie	7.12
Image Creek	4.70	Kinlough	7.90
Grand Pre	8.92	Kensington	6.09
Gnaton	9.37	Bloomfield	7.01
Winterton	4.78	Orangehill	4.28
Hatheway	9.22	Desford	5.55
Tales	8.16	Maitland	8.51
Sandringham	5.57	Clifford	6.29
Roseisle	7.76	Tobacco Creek	6.26
Arrowton	7.34	Brock	8.83
Glenora	8.80	Elm Creek	8.80
Hanlan	6.55	Stratford	7.35
Willow Range	8.56	Arsenault	6.49
Swan Creek	6.45	Valley River	6.28
Oak Leaf	7.79	Martineau	4.49
Mayne	7.44	Camper	5.98

It will not be argued that the settlers of the various municipalities in the Province have brought this rather dismaying state of facts about by creating an unduly large number of school districts. The expense involved in such a proceeding makes it an impossible hypothesis. Owing to the cold winters, and the exposure incident to prairie travel in the snow and storm, school districts must not be made so large as to endanger the lives of the children.

As it is, very many of them are much larger than they should be. A glance at the annual reports of the school trustees for 1894 will show that this is the case. Gold Stream, for instance, in township 13, range 11, west, consists of 20 sections. It is 5 miles by 4 miles in area. The school is almost central. The district extends from the school 2 miles east and 2 miles west, 2 miles north and 3 miles south. But Gold Stream is not one of the large school districts. Winchester consists of 26 sections, and is, therefore, 26 square miles in area. Culross covers 32 sections, each a square mile in area. Pleasant Point is of the same

dimensions. Caledonia and Scotia are spread over 35 square miles or sections each. Shellmouth, Ridgewood, Oakburn, Lilyfield, Wallace and many others cover each a township or 36 square miles. Shoal Lake is even larger including 40 sections within its boundaries, while Lake Francis comprises 44 sections. The distances to be travelled by the children can be arrived at by examining any one of these school districts. In Oakburn, the school is more nearly centrally situated than in many of the others, yet it is $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles from the northern boundary, over 3 miles from the south, a little over 2 miles from the west and nearly 4 miles from the eastern boundary. The school in Lilyfield is nearly 5 miles from its eastern boundary. In Shellmouth a child on section one would have to walk 7 or 8 miles to reach the school house in section 32. It is unnecessary to multiply instances. Hundreds might easily be given. Suffice it to say that competent persons estimate that in the rural districts the average distance necessarily travelled by a child to reach school is between one and one half and two miles and bad weather does not contract distance.

It is impossible, therefore, to lessen the size of the school districts. It may safely be assumed that every district with an average attendance of 10 pupils or less has been extended to the utmost limit allowed by law in order to secure even so scant an attendance. It is absolutely apparent that no one of the above 196 districts could be contracted. What folly is it then to talk of the division which the establishment of a dual system would necessitate. The taxpayer could not bear the additional burden incident to the erection of two schools where there are not one quarter as many scholars as one teacher can instruct. The practical educational difficulty arising from sparsity of settlement alone renders a separate school system quite impossible in Manitoba.



CHAPTER VI.

CHANGES MADE BY ACTS OF 1890--NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

The school system just outlined is that which was abolished by the Acts of 1890, and superseded by the system of non-sectarian schools at present in existence. The change was not introduced without consideration, nor was it made without cause. In the reply to the remedial order the following language is used by the Legislature of Manitoba :—

“The educational policy embodied in our present statutes was adopted after an examination of the results of the policy theretofore followed under which the separate Roman Catholic schools (now sought to be restored) had existed for a period of upwards of nineteen years. The said schools were found to be inefficient. As conducted under the Roman Catholic section of the board of education they did not possess the attributes of efficient modern public schools. Their conduct, management and regulation were defective.* As a result of leaving a large section of the population with no better means of education than was thus supplied, many people grew up in a state of illiteracy. So far as we are aware there has never been an attempt made to defend these schools on their merits, and we do not know of any ground upon which the expenditure of public money in their support, could be justified.”

The changes made by the Acts of 1890 are very clearly described by the judicial committee of the Privy Council in their judgment in the Barrett and Logan cases. Briefer summaries might be obtained but if this is less concise than some others, it is at any rate more authoritative than any of the rest. Their Lordships say :—“In 1890 the policy of the past nineteen years was reversed ; the denominational system of public education was entirely swept away. Two Acts in relation to education were passed. The first (53 Vic., c. 37) established a Department of Education and a board consisting of seven members known as the “Advisory Board.” Four members of the board were to be appointed by the Department of Education, two were to be elected by the public and high school teachers, and the seventh member was to be appointed by the University Council. One of the powers of the Advisory Board was to prescribe the forms of religious exercises to be used in the schools. The Public Schools Act, 1890 (53 Vic., c. 38), enacted that all Protestant and Roman Catholic school districts should be subject to the provisions of the Act

and that all public schools should be free schools. The provisions of the Act with regard to religious exercises are as follows :—

“6. Religious exercises in the public schools shall be conducted according to the regulations of the Advisory Board. The time for such religious exercises shall be just before the closing hour in the afternoon. In case the parent or guardian of any pupil notifies the teacher that he does not wish such pupil to attend such religious exercises, then such pupil shall be dismissed before such religious exercises take place.

“7. Religious exercises shall be held in a public school entirely at the option of the school trustees for the district, and, upon receiving written authority from the trustees, it shall be the duty of the teachers to hold such religious exercises.

“8 The public schools shall be entirely non-sectarian, and no religious exercises shall be allowed therein except as above provided.”

The Act then provides for the formation, alteration and union of school districts, for the election of school trustees, and for levying a rate on the taxable property in each school district for school purposes. In cities the municipal council is required to levy and collect upon the taxable property within the municipality such sums as the school trustees may require for school purposes. A portion of the legislative grant for educational purposes is allotted to public schools ; but it is provided that any school not conducted according to all the provisions of the Act, or any Act in force for the time being, or the regulations of the Department of Education, or the Advisory Board, shall not be deemed a public school within the meaning of the law and shall not participate in the legislative grant. Section 141 provides that no teacher shall use or permit to be used as text books any books except such as are authorized by the Advisory Board, and that no portion of the legislative grant shall be paid to any school in which unauthorized books are used.

THE ALLEGED CONFISCATION.

“Then there are two sections (178 and 179) which call for a passing notice, because, OWING APPARENTLY TO SOME MISAPPREHENSION, THEY ARE SPOKEN OF IN ONE OF THE JUDGMENTS UNDER APPEAL AS IF THEIR EFFECT WAS TO CONFISCATE ROMAN CATHOLIC PROPERTY. THEY APPLY TO CASES WHERE THE SAME TERRITORY WAS COVERED BY A PROTESTANT SCHOOL DISTRICT AND BY A ROMAN CATHOLIC SCHOOL DISTRICT. IN SUCH A CASE ROMAN

CATHOLICS WERE REALLY PLACED IN A BETTER POSITION THAN PROTESTANTS. Certain exemptions were to be made in their favour if the assets of their district exceeded its liabilities, or if the liabilities of the Protestant school district exceeded its assets. But no corresponding exemption were to be made in the case of Protestants."

These, their Lordships say, are the main provisions of the school Acts of 1890.

THE RELIGIOUS EXERCISES.

It may be added that the regulations as to religious exercises adopted by the Advisory Board require the reading, without note or comment, of any one of a large number of prescribed selections from either the authorized English version of the Bible or from the Catholic version, and the use of the Lord's prayer and another simple form of prayer which is also prescribed. The selections and form of prayer are given in full in appendix C. It was considered that while religious exercises of so simple a kind could be objectionable to no sect nor individual they would fully subserve the purpose for which they were intended, that of keeping up religious observances in the schools, while at the same time preventing our public schools from being used for the inculcation and diffusion of sectarian doctrines and dogmas.

NATIONAL SCHOOLS NOT PROTESTANT.

In answer to the objection that schools so organized are really Protestant schools their Lordships in the same judgment gave the following reply :—"THEY CANNOT ASSENT TO THE VIEW, WHICH SEEMS TO BE INDICATED BY ONE OF THE MEMBERS OF THE SUPREME COURT, THAT PUBLIC SCHOOLS UNDER THE ACT OF 1890 ARE IN REALITY PROTESTANT SCHOOLS. The Legislature has declared in so many words that the public schools shall be entirely unsectarian, and that principle is carried out throughout the Act."

IF ROMAN CATHOLICS CANNOT ATTEND, THE LAW IS NOT TO BLAME.

With regard to the claim put forward by the Roman Catholics that they should be entitled to the special privilege of superintending the schools attended by children of their denomination, their Lordships in the same judgment say :—"But then it is said that it is impossible for Roman Catholics, or for members of the

Church of England (if their views are correctly represented by the Bishop of Rupert's Land, who has given evidence in Logan's case), to send their children to public schools where the education is not superintended and directed by the authorities of their church, and that, therefore, Roman Catholics and members of the Church of England, who are taxed for public schools, and at the same time feel themselves compelled to support their own schools, are in a less favourable position than those who can take advantage of the free education provided by the Act of 1890. That may be so. But what right or privilege is violated or prejudicially affected by the law? IT IS NOT THE LAW THAT IS IN FAULT; IT IS OWING TO RELIGIOUS CONVICTIONS, WHICH EVERYBODY MUST RESPECT, AND TO THE TEACHING OF THEIR CHURCH, THAT ROMAN CATHOLICS AND MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND FIND THEMSELVES UNABLE TO PARTAKE OF ADVANTAGES WHICH THE LAW OFFERS TO ALL ALIKE."

Their Lordships further say:—"Notwithstanding the Public Schools Act, 1890, Roman Catholics and members of every other religious body in Manitoba are free to establish schools throughout the province; they are free to maintain their schools by school fees or voluntary subscriptions; they are free to conduct their schools according to their own religious tenets without molestation or interference. No child is compelled to attend a public school. No special advantage other than the advantage of a free education in schools conducted under public management is held out to those who do attend."

And,—“With the policy of the Act of 1890 their Lordships are not concerned. But they cannot help observing that, if the views of the respondents were to prevail, it would be extremely difficult for the Provincial Legislature, which has been entrusted with the exclusive power of making laws relating to education, to provide for the educational wants of the more sparsely inhabited districts of a country almost as large as Great Britain, and that the powers of the legislature, which on the face of the Act appear so large, would be limited to the useful but somewhat humble office of making regulations for the sanitary conditions of school-houses, imposing rates for the support of denominational schools, enforcing the compulsory attendance of scholars, and matters of that sort."

CHAPTER VII.

DID THE ACTS OF 1890 PRESCRIBE PROTESTANT EXERCISES OR CONFISCATE ROMAN CATHOLIC PROPERTY—A REPLY TO DR. GRANT.

Two most serious charges are made against the Acts of 1890—one, that they have saddled Protestant religious exercises upon the public schools, the other that the Protestants have confiscated Roman Catholic property by legislative enactment. These statements are of so grave a nature as to deserve to be treated in a separate chapter. Mr. Laurier has stated that if the public schools are in reality Protestant schools, their existence is a standing injustice to Roman Catholics. No one professing the least sense of justice or fair play will dissent from his views. Anything in the nature of the confiscation of private property is quite as reprehensible, and can meet with nothing but condemnation.

THE ALLEGED PROTESTANT EXERCISES.

In the course of one of his letters in the *Globe*, Dr. Grant tells us that the Rev. Father Cherrier would object to the public school, and one of his reasons would probably be that "the religious exercises in it are practically what they were when the school was under the Protestant section of the old board." The average reader would infer from this that the exercises in use under the Protestant section of the old board were distinctively Protestant, and that they had been made a part of the new system by the legislation of 1890. Surely after having put such a statement in the mouth of Rev. Father Cherrier, and having given it currency as an argument, it was Dr. Grant's duty to establish its truth, or show wherein it is misleading. It is extremely misleading for the reason that neither the religious exercises in use under the Protestant section of the old board nor those at present prescribed are in any sense Protestant. The old Protestant section was so called simply to distinguish it from the Roman Catholic section. While under the Roman Catholic section the doctrines of that church were taught, denominationalism was unknown in the teaching under the Protestant section. The so called Protestant schools were public schools to the full extent and meaning of the word and "Protestant section" in their case was a misnomer. As Dr. Grant himself in another

part of his letter admits that "the schools of the Protestant section of the board were to all intents and purposes public schools," it is difficult to see why; having attributed such a statement to Rev. Father Cherrier, he did not refute it promptly and for all time.

The regulations of the Advisory Board regarding religious exercises in the public schools were adopted May 21st, 1890, after the passage of the Public Schools Act. They provided for the reading without note or comment, of any one of a number of selections from the authorized English version of the Bible or from the Douay, Roman Catholic version. (See full list of selections, appendix C.) They also provided for the reading of the following forms of prayer :—

"Most merciful God, we yield Thee our humble and hearty thanks for Thy fatherly care and preservation of us this day, and for the progress which Thou hast enabled us to make in useful learning ; we pray Thee to imprint upon our minds whatever good instructions we have received, and to bless them to the advancement of our temporal and eternal welfare ; and pardon, we implore Thee, all that Thou hast seen amiss in our thoughts, words, and actions, May Thy good Providence still guide and keep us during the approaching interval of rest and relaxation, so that we may be prepared to enter on the duties of the morrow with renewed vigor both of body and mind ; and preserve us we beseech Thee, now and forever, both outwardly in our bodies and inwardly in our souls, for the sake of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord. Amen."

Our Father, who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in Heaven, give us this day our daily bread ; and forgive us our trepsasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us ; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. Amen.

The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all evermore. Amen.

What is there of a Protestant character in these requirements ? The Roman Catholic certainly cannot detect any Protestantism lurking in the provisions allowing him to read from his own Douay version of the Bible. Nor can it be said that there is anything of a Protestant character in the prescribed forms of

prayer. Nor does it make their religious exercises Protestant to say that they are practically the same as those prescribed by the Protestant section of the old board. It is worth noting, however, that they are practically the same as the religious exercises adopted in the public schools of Ontario without objection from the late Archbishop Lynch, the head of the Roman Catholic church in that Province. In his celebrated speech on "Provincial Issues—The Religious Cry," at Hamilton, during the local campaign of 1886, the Hon. Edward Blake pointed out that Principal Caven, the head of the Knox Presbyterian Theological College, Provost Body, the head of Trinity University, one of the Theological Colleges of the Church of England, Principal Nelles, the head of Victoria, the Methodist University, and Principal Castle, the head of the Baptist College, had agreed upon the form of undenominational religious exercises in the Ontario public schools, of which the religious exercises in the public schools of Manitoba are practically a copy. "The churches" said Mr. Blake, "approached each other; they agreed to co-operate with each other, and I thanked God for it. I thanked God for it because I thought it was an indication that we were beginning to sink, in some degree, our sectarianism, and to realize our points of agreement; to recognize more and more how much there was that we all held together of the fundamental common truths of christianity. I thanked God for it because I thought it pointed to a broader, more generous, more Christian feeling, which boded great good for the church, and for the world." He further drew attention to the fact just referred to, that the late Archbishop Lynch, the head of the Roman Catholic Church in Ontario, did not object to the introduction of these undenominational religious exercises into the public schools of Ontario, although it was at those schools that two-thirds of the Roman Catholic children of the Province received their education.

I only need add that the contention that the religious exercises in the Manitoba public schools are Protestant has been finally and effectually disposed of by the judgment of the judicial committee of the Imperial Privy Council in the Barrett and Logan cases where their Lordships say that "they cannot consent to the view, which seems to be indicated by one of the members of the Supreme Court, that public schools under the act of 1890

are in reality Protestant schools. The Legislature has declared in so many words that the public schools shall be entirely unsectarian, and that principle is carried out throughout the Act."

THE CONFISCATION BOGEY.

While Dr. Grant appears to have lacked in fairness in for a moment allowing the idea to go abroad that the religious exercises in the public schools are Protestant in character, his references to the alleged confiscation of Roman Catholic property are so ridiculous and unjust that they are explicable only upon the theory that during his meteoric transit through Manitoba the learned gentleman had time to be most shamelessly "stuffed."

He says on this subject:—"Let us now consider briefly what was done in cases where a Catholic school district covered the same territory as any Protestant school district. With regard to such it was enacted that "such Catholic school districts shall, upon the coming into force of this Act, cease to exist, and all the assets of Catholic school districts shall belong to, and all liabilities thereof be paid by the public school district. Could anything be more discourteous and unjust? * * * The Act was assented to on March 31st; it came into force on May 1st, and their position, work and assets were transferred to the Protestant board, a body in whom at that time they had very little confidence. True, the Protestant board was also to assume their liabilities, but whereas these liabilities were nominal because they had lived prudently, the liabilities of the other board were great. The R. C. trustees contend that the Protestant board had bought sites and built extravagantly in the boom days. It was bad enough, they assert, to saddle them with a heavy load of debt, which others had contracted, and to tax them for the support of Protestant schools, and "to wipe out of existence as a board without a word of explanation, as if, to quote Mr. Nicholas Bawlf's emphatic language, "we were a lot of dough heads, with whom there was no use consulting," added insult to injury."

In considering the dreadful nature of these provisions it is in the first place necessary to remember that the dire consequences referred to are to take place only in cases where a Roman Catholic school district covers the same territory as any Protestant school district. In the next place before becoming quite horror stricken, it is as well to attach some importance to the assurance

of the Department of Education that no single case of such a coincidence has yet been discovered. Thirdly, even if such a case should occur, there can be no foundation for the charge that the effect of the Act is to transfer Roman Catholic property to Protestants or to anyone else. While it is true that the schools built by the Roman Catholic section were deemed to be assets of that section, the section itself was but part of a Public Board of Education. Surely it was never intended even under the old system, bad as it was, to provide a public system of education, and a public system of taxation, to the end and intent that the school buildings and other assets acquired from time to time should become the private property of the Roman Catholic church. As Mr. Haldane put it in his recent argument before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on the referred case :—"It is quite true they were built out of rates that were levied on the community, except that which the Roman Catholics contributed for the building of their schools to those rates was applied to the building of Catholic schools, but they were not schools belonging to the Catholics. It was only that the rates which were a liability on the whole community, were in this case used for the building of Roman Catholic schools."

Fourthly, in their judgment in the Barret and Logan cases the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council say:—"Then there are two sections (178 and 179) which call for a passing notice, because, owing apparently to some misapprehension, they are spoken of in one of the judgments under appeal as if their effect was to confiscate Roman Catholic property. They apply to cases where the same territory was covered by a Protestant school district and by a Roman Catholic school district. In such case Roman Catholics were really placed in a better position than Protestants. Certain exemptions were to be made in their favor if the assets of their district exceeded its liabilities, or if the liabilities of the Protestant school district exceeded its assets. But no corresponding exemptions were to be made in the case of Protestants." Fifthly, If any injustice has been done, it has never been made known to the Government of the Province. and more than that they are willing if any such injustice can be established, to make full and fair compensation to the aggrieved parties. In their reply to the Remedial Order they say:—"We understand that it has been lately suggested that private funds of the Roman

Catholic Church and people had been invested in school buildings and land that are now appropriated for public school purposes. No evidence of such fact has ever been laid before us so far as we can ascertain, but we profess ourselves willing if any such injustice can be established, to make full and fair compensation therefor."

And now let us contemplate some other effects of this gruesome Act. Does Dr. Grant know that the assets of the Winnipeg Public School Board alone amount to \$424,648.66, of which \$327,500.00 is the estimated value of its school sites and buildings? Does he know that in 1890 when the new school law was enacted the assets of the Protestant section of the old board amounted to \$904,682.00 and that the assets of the public schools now total \$1,469,282. If he is aware of all this, would it not have been as well to point out to the people of Canada that while this wealth was accumulated by the taxation of Protestants quite as much as any Roman Catholic assets were acquired by the taxation of Roman Catholics, the Protestants of Manitoba have by this "unjust" legislation of 1890 shown no hesitation in coming forward and offering to share all that they have with their Roman Catholic fellow citizens. When the Act of 1890 was passed the Roman Catholic section was able to show but a paltry \$6,000 invested in public school buildings in the Province. While I am unable to find that one of these schools has been taken possession of under the existing law, it is beyond question that by that much maligned legislation Roman Catholics have been made equal possessors with Protestants of assets amounting to \$1,468,282. And yet Dr. Grant is shocked at the piratical instincts of his fellow Protestants and quite pathetic over "the modest little frame building called the Immaculate Conception taught by the Reverend Sisters of Jesus and Mary."

CHAPTER VIII.

WHY THE ACTS OF 1890 WERE PASSED.

It is a mistake to suppose that there had been no agitation against separate schools in Manitoba previous to 1889-90. The defective nature of their teaching and the baneful influences which they exercised had been perceived by the people of the Province fourteen or fifteen years before the agitation of 1890 ushered in legislation providing for national schools. So early as 1874, Mr. W. F. Luxton in an address to the electors of Rockwood strongly inveighed against separate schools. Amongst other things he said: "That the school system of Manitoba is accomplishing much less than a national system should, is no cause for surprise. Evidently with those who legislated it into existence, the bona fide education of the people was a consideration secondary to making the public schools nurseries for the Roman Catholic Church." In 1876 the agitation increased in strength. The columns of the newspapers were at times filled with the controversy. The Protestant section of the Board of Education adopted a series of resolutions which show that the defects of the separate school system were as well understood in 1876 as they are to-day. And in the Legislature Premier Davis introduced amendments to the school act which were passed by the Assembly, but afterwards voted down in the Legislative Council where the Roman Catholic Church controlled a majority of the representatives. The Council itself was voted out of existence not long afterwards.

The resolutions adopted by the Protestant section of the school board at that time derive additional interest in view of the legislation of 1890. In them are foreshadowed many of the leading features of the national school system now in existence. The following minutes of a meeting held in October 1876 will make this clear:—

OCTOBER 4th, 1876.

"A meeting of the Protestant section of the Board of Education was held in the office of the Honorable, The Minister of Public Works, Winnipeg, on Wednesday, Oct. 4th, 1876. Members present: The Right Reverend, the Bishop of Rupert's Land, Rev. James Robertson, J. H. Bell, Esq., W. H. Hall, Esq., Captain Kennedy, W. B. Hall, Esq., S. Mulvey, Esq., who came late, and in the superintendent, (Rev. W. C. Pinkham).

The superintendent having stated the object of the meeting, Mr. Ross moved, seconded by Mr. Bell, that the executive committee be hereby empowered to draft a school bill embodying the following principles with others, viz :

1. The establishment of a purely non-sectarian system of public schools.
2. The appointment of one or more inspectors for said schools.
3. The compulsory use of English text books in all public schools.
4. All public schools subject to the same rules and regulations.
5. The establishment, as soon as practicable, of a training school for teachers.
6. The examining, grading and licensing of all public school teachers by one board of examiners and subject to the same rules and regulations.
7. The abolition of the Board of Education in its present sectional character and the appointment of a new board without sections.
8. The division of the school moneys amongst public schools as follows :—A percentage to be divided equally among all schools, a percentage to be divided according to the average attendance, and the remainder to be placed at the disposal of the Board of Education to be used as they see fit in the interests of education.
9. Provisions for taking a poll whenever the same may be required. Carried unanimously.

The motives which actuated the leaders of the agitation of 1876 were no doubt in the main the same as those which led to the reform of the school law of the Province in 1890. They saw that the Roman Catholics were enjoying under the law a privilege allowed to no other denomination. They failed to perceive any justification for such a state of affairs. There is no reason in the nature of things why the Roman Church should be selected from all others and endowed with power to teach its own particular doctrines in the public schools. In demanding such a concession it can not be said to demand a natural right. There is no inherent connection between teaching the ordinary educational branches of a Public School and Roman Catholicism or Calvinism or the religious teaching of any other sect or community. It is surely absurd on the part of the Roman Catholic to say that his conscientious convictions require that the teaching of his church should be grafted upon the educational system of this or any other country. The claim is essentially one of special privilege. In refusing to accede to it, no moral right is denied, no

natural justice is refused. Until our Roman Catholic fellow citizens show us that there is nothing ludicrous in their "conscientious conviction" that they should have a privilege which no one else enjoys, as part of a system which is complete without anything of the kind, it will be difficult to share the arising from the alleged withdrawal of natural or moral rights. On the contrary fairness itself implies the refusal of all special privileges.

There are many grounds of objection to separate schools outside the question of special privilege but most of them are too obvious to be dwelt upon. It cannot be conducive to our national welfare to bring up the two great sections of our population apart from each other. Separation results in ignorance and ignorance begets suspicion. Race and religious jealousies are the necessary result. The whole tendency of the separate educational system is to keep asunder the French and English races in the Dominion, and to prevent forever the welding into one nation of our component parts. If the separate school system had been devised for the express purpose of keeping French and English apart, of preventing the creation of any bond of sympathy between them, of avoiding the possibility of common national desires and aspirations, and even for the purpose of maintaining that ignorance which begets suspicion, prejudice and race hatred, it could not have been much more cunningly planned.

The above are doubtless some of the reasons which weighed heavily in the minds of the people of this Province when they decided to put an end to separate schools if it were possible to do so. Other reasons have been elaborated in the preceding paper. We did not and do not desire a system the three most noticeable features of which would seem to have been:—

1. Its thorough inefficiency from an educational point of view.
2. The absolute control exercised by the Roman Catholic priesthood, and the complete immersion of the pupil in Roman Catholic ideas and influences.
3. The existence and development of French ideas and aspirations to the almost entire exclusion of those that are British.

Nor did we desire to retain a system which owing to our sparse population, scattered settlement, and other such causes is quite impossible.

But beyond all these reasons there are many others quite as weighty which afford a powerful argument against the separate school as an institution. It has a bad record. There seems to

be ample justification for saying that wherever the Roman Catholic parochial school is the medium of education, ignorance is rife and when ignorance is at home crime is not a stranger.

ILLITERACY IN ROMAN CATHOLIC COUNTRIES.

The census of the United States for 1880 showed that out of its total population over ten years of age only 9.4 per cent. were unable to write. In Victoria, in 1881, 92½ per cent. of the population fifteen years of age and over could both read and write, and only 3½ per cent. were entirely illiterate. In England, during the year 1890, only 7.2 per cent. of the males and 8.3 per cent. of the females signed by mark in the marriage registers. In Scotland only 4.30 per cent. of the males and 7.38 of the females signed by mark in the marriage registers in 1889. These are countries where Roman Catholicism and its methods of instruction are not in the ascendant. Turn but for a moment and glance at the illiteracy prevalent in countries where Roman Catholics are numerous and more or less nearly supreme! While in Scotland, in 1886, out of a total vote polled of 447,588, only 7,708 were illiterate, in Ireland, in the same year, out of a total vote polled of 450,906, 98,404, or about 14 times as many of the voters in proportion were unable to read or write. In Italy, where the Roman Catholics had 51 archbishops, 223 bishops, 55,263 churches and chapels, 76,560 parish priests and 28,991 religious persons to help enlighten the people, no less than 58.89 per cent. of the males and 72.93 per cent. of the females were, in the year 1881, unable to read and write. In Spain, where Roman Catholicism is the established religion, where there were in 1884, 32,435 priests, 14,592 nuns, 78,564 churches, and 1,684 monks, 30.64 per cent. of the males and 41.37 per cent. of the females were not even able to read when the census was taken in 1887. In Portugal and its islands, where the state religion is Roman Catholicism, and the Protestants do not exceed 500 in number, the number of illiterate inhabitants in 1878 was 3,751,774, or 82 per cent. of the total population, including children. All the above figures and many more of like interest may be found in the Statesman's Year Book of 1892, and cannot be successfully challenged.

The following statement has been compiled from the Reports of The United States Commissioner of Education, the Statesman's Year Book for 1887 and other sources ;—

Roman Catholic Countries.	Area, Sq. Miles	Population	Percentage Catholics	Percentage Illiteracy
Venezuela	439,120	2,075,245	90	90.
Austria-Hungary	240,942	39,224,511	67.5	32.
France	204,092	38,218,903	78.5	25.
Brazil	3,219,000	19,922,375	99.	84.
Spain	191,100	16,958,178	99	60.
Portugal	36,028	4,708,178	99	82.
Belgium	11,373	5,520,009	99.	42.
Italy	110,620	28,459,628	99.	61.94
8 Countries, Total	4,452,275	148,087,027	731.1	476.94
Average 8 Countries			91.3	59.61

Protestant Countries	Area, Sq. Miles	Population.	Percentage Protestants	Percentage Illiteracy
Victoria	87,884	1,009,753	73.	.035
Sweden	170,979	4,682,769	99.	.30
Switzerland	15,892	2,846,102	59.	.30
Netherlands	12,648	4,336,012	66.	10.05
Germany	211,149	46,852,680	62.6	1.27
Denmark	14,121	1,980,259	99.	.36
Great Britain	120,832	30,066,646	93.3	11.09
United States	3,501,404	57,928,609	86.4	9.40
8 Countries, Total	4,134,309	149,702,830	638.3	33.255
Average 8 Countries			79.78	4.156

In the above table eight Roman Catholic countries are contrasted with eight Protestant countries. Each group covers an area of about 4,000,000 square miles, and contains about 150,000,000 people. In one group the average percentage of Roman Catholics is 91.3. In the other the average percentage of Protestants is 79.78. Each religion is overwhelmingly powerful in its own group, and with this result that while the average percentage of illiteracy in the Roman Catholic group is 59.61, in

the Protestant it is 4.15. In other words illiteracy is 14.343 times greater in the Roman Catholic than in the Protestant group. Coming near home, what is more notorious than that in Quebec the oldest Canadian Province, illiteracy still prevails to an extent unknown in any other part of Canada, except perhaps some of the French Roman Catholic settlements of Manitoba.

SOME INTERESTING CRIMINAL STATISTICS.

A glance at the Dominion criminal statistics for the year ending September 30th, 1890, shows the following convictions for indictable offences;—Class I. Offences against the person, Baptists, 23; Roman Catholics, 437; Church of England, 143; Methodists, 81; Presbyterians, 68; Protestants, 54; other denominations, 23. Class II. Offences against property with violence—Baptists, 7; Roman Catholics 140; Church of England, 51; Methodists, 30; Presbyterians, 23; and so on. Class III. Offences against property without violence—Baptists, 62; Roman Catholics, 1194; Church of England, 406; Methodists, 272; Presbyterians, 153; and so on. Taking the total of convictions for indictable offences for the year we find them classified as follows:—Roman Catholics, 1896; all other denominations taken together, 1760. The Roman Catholics, though not more than two-fifths of the population, were responsible for more than half the crime.

FOREIGN CRIMINAL STATISTICS.

The Almanico Popolare of Turin has been cited as stating that there is in England one murder in 178,000 people; in Catholic Spain, one in 4,113; and in the Roman States, one in 780: or 237 times as many murders in the Catholic Roman States as in England in proportion to population. In his "Speeches of Pope Pius IX.," at page 24, Mr. Gladstone points out that there was more Roman crime during the last two years of the papal rule than in the two years following.

STATISTICS OF CRIMINAL IMMORALITY.

The same authority has been quoted as stating that the legitimate children in London number $24\frac{3}{4}$ to one illegitimate; in Vienna, one legitimate to $1\frac{1}{8}$ illegitimate; in Rome, one legitimate to $2\frac{2}{3}$ illegitimate. Rome, the very centre of priestly in-

fluence, is as regards illegitimacy, sixty-six times worse than London. Anything more amazing than this to a people whose national schools are stigmatized as "godless" because they do not allow instruction in the Roman Catholic creed, could not well be imagined. If the lack of instruction in the tenets of the Roman Catholic faith is "godlessness," and leads to immorality, it is strange that immorality and crime are so prevalent in countries where there is a superabundance of Roman Catholic influences.

VICTOR HUGO'S TERRIBLE INDICTMENT.

"But," says Father Cherrier, "when Italy or Spain are charged with illiteracy very little indeed is said of the standard of fine arts in those countries, particularly the former, which is to this day considered as the land of the great masters in painting, statuary, sculpture and so forth." Father Cherrier is mistaken. A great deal has been said on this very question. When the Roman Hierarchy sought to obtain control of education in France, Victor Hugo delivered that terrible indictment which the Rev. Father Cherrier seems to have overlooked, and of which I will cite a portion ;—"And you claim the liberty of teaching. Stop! be sincere ; let us understand the liberty which you claim. It is the liberty of not teaching. You wish us to give you the people to instruct. Very well. Let us see your pupils. Let us see those you produced. What have you done for Italy? What have you done for Spain? For centuries you have kept in your hands, at your discretion, at your school, these two great nations, illustrious among the illustrious. What have you done for them? I shall tell you. Thanks to you, Italy, whose name no man who thinks can any longer pronounce without inexpressible filial emotions—Italy, mother of genius and of nations which has spread over all the universe all the most brilliant marvels of poetry and the arts, Italy—which has taught mankind to read—now knows not how to read! Yes, Italy is of all the states of Europe, that where the smallest number know how to read! Spain, magnificently endowed Spain, which received from the Romans her first civilization ; from the Arabs her second civilization ; from Providence and in spite of you, a world America—Spain,

thanks to you, a yoke of stupor, which is a yoke of degradation and decay ; Spain has lost this secret power which it had from the Romans ; this genius of art which it had from the Arabs ; this world which it had from God, and in exchange for all you have made it lose, it has received from you the Inquisition—the Inquisition, which certain men of the party tried to-day to re-establish ; which has burned on the funeral pile millions of men ; the Inquisition which disinterred the dead to burn them as heretics ; which declared the children of heretics infamous and incapable of any public honors, excepting only those who shall have denounced their fathers ; the Inquisition, which, while I speak, still holds in the Papal library the manuscripts of Galileo sealed under the Papal signet. These are your masterpieces. This fire which we call Italy you have extinguished. This colossus that we call Spain you have undermined—the one in ashes, the other in ruins. This is what you have done for two great nations. What do you wish to do for France ? Stop ! you have just come from Rome ! I congratulate you, you have had fine success there. You came from gagging the Roman people, and now you wish to gag the French people. I understand. This attempt is still more fine, but take care, it is dangerous. France is a lion, and is still alive !” What the hierarchy failed to effect in France they are now seeking to fasten upon Canada !

The above are some of the reasons why the Acts of 1890 were passed. In one of his letters Dr. Grant says :—“The men responsible for the change did not attack the old system for faulty administration or poor results ; but they took the ground that it was wrong in principle and must be abolished root and branch.” In this, as in very many other of his statements, Dr. Grant is entirely wrong. Anyone at all conversant with educational matters in Manitoba must know that for years the inefficiency of the Roman Catholic separate schools had been a recognized evil. Mr. Luxton so stated it in 1874. The resolutions of the Protestant section in 1876 point to the same thing. The statistical material collected by the Government in 1889 before the introduction of the Acts of 1890 and the debates in the Legislature all show that nearly all, if not all, the considerations I have referred to were in the minds of our legislators when they decided to put an end to such schools. They determined to abolish them

"root and branch" not only because they were wrong in principle, but also because their record was bad both here and everywhere. It was believed then as it is believed now that any attempted compromise by which any portion of such a system is retained must inevitably lead to most undesirable results.

CHAPTER IX.

MANITOBA FOLLOWED THE EXAMPLE OF THE CIVILIZED WORLD.
—MUST SHE PUT ON THE CAST OFF GARMENTS OF EUROPE?

In taking her stand in favor of national and seeking to get rid of separate schools, Manitoba has but followed the enlightened example of the civilized world. According to the *Encyclopedia Britannica* (Vol. VIII p. 712) in all Europe education is passing from the control of the clergy into the hands of the state. The same is said to be true even of Mexico, Central America and South America.

SWITZERLAND.

In Switzerland some cantons are almost exclusively Catholic, while in others Protestants constitute the large majority. Care is taken that there is no compulsion to attend religious services and no interference with liberty of conscience. The exercises consist in hymns, prayers, and reading the Bible, generally without comment. Sectarian education in the sense in which the Roman Catholics demand it is not found to be necessary.

BELGIUM.

While the Liberals of Belgium favor purely secular schools, the Conservatives have always strongly contended for denominational teaching. In the large centres of industry, despite the interference of the clergy and the strife of political parties, instruction continues to be secular. This is the case notwithstanding that "The Roman Catholic religion is professed by nearly the entire population of Belgium." (*Statesman's Year Book* 1891, p. 374.)

ITALY.

In Italy "the priesthood claims to direct the education of the masses, but the changes which have taken place in the temporal rule have greatly restricted their influence. Speaking generally, religious instruction is only imparted once a week by laymen, and only to those children whose parents desire it. It does not form part of the national system, and, as in other Catholic countries, the clergy are bitterly opposed to education by the state as at present regulated." ("Subjects of the Day," May, 1890, p. 75.)

FRANCE.

"In France the struggle for priestly ascendancy has exercised

greater influence over State instruction than in any other European country, and entirely to the disadvantage of the clergy. The department of education professes complete neutrality towards the religious denominations, but it is by exclusion and not by the concurrent endorsement of education. Hence the State system which is purely secular, is usually designated "Godless education," and it is no doubt one of the results against priestly interference in other than religious affairs."—(Ibid.)

IRELAND.

Under the National School system of Ireland the Roman Catholics and Protestants are educated together. The conscience clause provides that when "once the religion of a child is entered on the register, the teacher, if of a different religious persuasion, must not permit the child, unless under the written authority of the parent on a certificate duly witnessed, to remain in attendance whilst religious instruction was proceeding." Bishop Doyle, the vehement advocate of Catholic schools, felt compelled to say: "I cannot refrain from expressing the ardent desire I feel of having the children of all Irishmen without distinction united in schools and in every relation of life." The Pope, though at first opposed to the system, finally called upon his Bishops to thank the Government "for giving so much of its wealth to the poor children of the country."—(Ibid. p. 59.)

AUSTRALIA.

"The Australian colonies are essentially democratic, and so, like the United States, they all base their common school systems on the principles of religious freedom, and the non-establishment of any particular form of religious belief."—(Ibid. p. 109.)

THE UNITED STATES.

E. E. White, LL. D., Superintendent of Public Schools of Cincinnati, in a paper read before the National Educational Association in Topeka, Kansas, July 15, 1886, says, (p. 10): "The great majority of American schools are religious without being sectarian; and it is high time that this fact were more universally recognized. It is doubtless true that the most impressive forms of presenting religious sanctions to the mind and heart of the young are prayer, silent or spoken, and the reverent reading of the Bible, especially those portions of the present human duty in its relation to the Divine Will—forms still per-

mitted and widely used in four-fifths of the American schools.”
—(Papers of the American Historical Association, Vol. 2, No. 4,
p. 457.)

MEXICO.

“What do Mexico, Central America, and South America think of the parochial school? I ho’d in my hand a book published in 1888, entitled, “The Capitals of South America,” by William E. Curtis, appointed in 1885, by President Arthur, Secretary of the Spanish American Commission. He had exceptional advantages to ascertain the facts, and is a fair writer. Let Mexico speak : Parochial schools have been prohibited. Free public schools have been established. Whoever sends a child to a parochial school is fined (p. 4).” (Dr. Sydney Strong in the Envelope Series Quarterly, Boston, January, 1893.)

CENTRAL AMERICA.

“Let the Republics of Central America speak : *Guatemala*.—Children between the ages of 8 and 14 are required to attend the public schools (p. 84). *San Salvador*.—Education is free and compulsory and under State control (p. 178). *Costa Rica*.—Education under State control and is compulsory (p. 218). Whoever sends a child to a parochial school is subject to a heavy fine.” (Ibid).

SOUTH AMERICAN REPUBLICS.

“Let the Republics of South America, with their 50,000,000 of people, speak : Remember that until 20 years ago the education of the children was in parochial schools under control of the clergy. *Argentine Republic*.—Free public schools under State control and a compulsory law, closely modelled after the system of the State of Michigan (p. 557). *Chili*.—Public, non-sectarian schools. Whoever sends a child to a parochial school is fined (p. 494). *Uruguay*.—Parochial schools have been closed, and free public schools have been established (p. 611). *Venezuela*.—Schools are supported by the government (p. 27). *Brazil*.—The same (p. 678). So on through the list, every one of them repudiating the parochial school and establishing free public schools, until we reach Ecuador.” (Ibid).

THE EXAMPLE SET BY OUR OWN CANADIAN PROVINCES.

NEW BRUNSWICK.

In the Province of New Brunswick the school system is purely

national, and non-sectarian. Regulation 21 of the Board of Education provides that: It shall be the privilege of every teacher to open and close the daily exercises of the school by reading a portion of Scripture (out of the common or Douay version, as he may prefer), and by offering the Lord's Prayer. Any other prayer may be used by permission of the Board of Trustees. But no teacher shall compel any pupil to be present at these exercises against the wish of his parent or guardian expressed in writing to the Board of Trustees. The national non-sectarian system has been in existence in New Brunswick for more than twenty years, and there is not the slightest probability that it will be interfered with.

NOVA SCOTIA.

Sectarian public schools are unknown in Nova Scotia. George Iles, of New York, in an article on "The Separate School System of Canada," in "Education," a Boston publication, in June, 1890, said: "In Nova Scotia one-fourth of the inhabitants are Catholics; public sentiment has always sternly opposed a separate school system, and the Church of Rome has never seriously thrown herself into the attempt to plant it there."

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Referring to the improvement of the national school law in New Brunswick, the late Archbishop Tache, in a pamphlet on the school question published in 1877, wrote, "all these hardships imposed upon the Catholics of New Brunswick are said by some to be nothing but 'fair play,' 'equal rights,' etc., so the good people of Prince Edward Island thought they could do no better than follow such examples. Out of a population of 94,021, Catholics number 40,442. The Non-Catholics took advantage of the small difference in numbers, the whole Island was agitated on the school question, fanaticism was aroused, war declared against Catholic schools, and as one and one-third are more than one the 'non-sectarian system' prevailed." Another way of putting this would be by saying that the people of Prince Edward Island were determined to secure national schools, and succeeded in realizing their wish.

BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Like the provinces in the east the province in the extreme west is favored with national unsectarian schools. Section 62 of

Chapter 40 of the "Public School Act, 1891," provides as follows :
"All Public Schools established under the provisions of this Act shall be conducted on strictly secular and non-sectarian principles. The highest morality shall be inculcated but no religious dogma nor creed shall be taught. The Lord's Prayer may be used in opening or closing the school."

To ask Manitoba to go back to separate schools is to demand a return to a system which is rapidly being driven out of Roman Catholic as well as out of Protestant countries all over the world. It is to insist that one of the newest and most progressive countries in modern times, shall put on the discredited and cast off garments of Mexico and Central America. A more startling attempt to enforce retrogression upon one of the most, perhaps the most, progressive of communities in existence to-day could not be imagined.

CHAPTER X.

THE FOUR ARGUMENTS FOR A RETURN TO THE OLD SYSTEM. NO. I.—THE CONSCIENCE ARGUMENT.

In the foregoing pages I have endeavored to bring together some of the facts an intimate acquaintance with which is necessary to an intelligent understanding of the Manitoba School question. But I have by no means sought to exhaust the evidence which goes to discredit the separate school as an institution. Should a commission be appointed,—the course suggested by the Provincial Government and approved of in so many influential quarters—I have no doubt but that it will be an easy task for the Provincial authorities to convince the people of Canada that when they attacked the separate school system in Manitoba they sought to rid the country of a malignant evil.

THE FOUR ARGUMENTS.

It is next in order to examine into the reasons given why this Province should be coerced into submitting herself to the degrading thralldom from which she has for the time being at least, escaped. They are as follows:—

1. The Roman Catholic is entitled to separate schools as a matter of conscientious conviction.
2. The Roman Catholic is entitled to separate schools by treaty.
3. He is entitled to separate schools by law.
4. If he is not absolutely entitled to separate schools as a matter of conscience, treaty, or law, we must give them to him because he demands them. This is Dr. Grant's "gospel of despair."

The above seem to be the only reasons given. No one seeks seriously to defend the separate schools of Manitoba on their merits.

In examining the arguments thus assigned in favor of separate schools, it will be convenient to take them in the order just given, that is first the argument based broadly on conscientious conviction, next that based on the treaty idea, thirdly, the legal argument, and lastly Dr. Grant's "gospel of despair."

A MATTER OF CONSCIENCE.

The Roman Catholic citizen states that his conscience requires

him to insist upon doctrinal teaching in the public schools, and inveighs loudly against any interference with what he calls his liberty of conscience. His objection is not that under a national school training his child will be taught anything offensive, but that too little attention will be given to his religious education in the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church. His persecution consists in this that he is not allowed to engraft sectarian instruction upon the public school system. He blames the law not because it requires him to do something that clashes with his conscience, but because it will not do all that his so-called convictions require. This claim is not a question of conscience but a question of special privilege. If this is religious persecution the definition of the offence universally accepted will require very radical revision.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CONSCIENCE—WHAT IS IT?

When the Roman Catholic loudly declaims against his conscientious convictions being interfered with, he cannot object to stating what religious convictions his church allows him as an individual to entertain. In "The Vatican Decrees in their bearing on Civil Allegiance," the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, without "citing any of the fearfully energetic epithets in which the condemnations are sometimes clothed," mentions a few of the propositions, "the holders of which have been condemned by the See of Rome during" the twelve or fifteen years previous to 1874. The following have been condemned:—

1. Those who maintain the liberty of the press. Encyclical Letter of Pope Gregory XVI, in 1831; and of Pope Pius IX, in 1864.
2. Or the LIBERTY OF CONSCIENCE or of Worship. Encyclical of Pius IX, December 8, 1864.
3. Or the liberty of speech. "Syllabus" of March 18, 1861, Prop. lxx. Encyclical of Pope Pius IX, December 8, 1864.
4. Or that in conflict of laws, civil and ecclesiastical, the civil law should prevail. "Syllabus," Prop. xlii.
5. Or that any method of instruction of youth, solely secular, may be approved. Ibid, Prop. xlviii.
6. Or that any other religion than the Roman Catholic Religion may be established by a state. Ibid, Prop. lxxvii.

7. Or that in "countries called Catholic" the free exercise of other religions may laudably be allowed. Ibid, Prop. lxxviii.

The above are but seven instances out of eighteen given by Mr. Gladstone, whose list is but a partial one. In the face of these facts the claim of the Roman Catholic to liberty of conscience as an individual seems based upon little or no foundation. The Church in whose name he so loudly demands liberty of conscience has strongly condemned liberty of speech, liberty of the press, liberty of worship, and the very liberty of conscience which he demands. If the Roman Catholic is deprived of liberty of conscience his quarrel is with his Church which deprives him of so much, and not with this Province in which he is absolutely free.

A PRIEST-MADE CONSCIENCE.

There is no use blinking the facts, and if the Roman Catholic citizen is candid he will admit that his quarrel with national schools arises from no conscientious convictions as an individual, but from the attitude taken by his Church. Dr. Ryerson, who was Chief Superintendent of Education of Upper Canada and Ontario from 1844 to 1876, plainly perceived this state of facts, and thus explained the position in one of his writings before Confederation :

"Separate school education is now a dogma of the Roman Catholic Church, as much as the immaculate conception is. In 1850 the Roman Catholic College of Thurles, in Ireland, passed a statute condemnatory of mixed education ; the Roman Catholic Provincial Colleges of Baltimore and Quebec have since done the same. These statutes have been ratified by the Pope. This is therefore the dogma of the Church, however much it may fall into disuse in some places, as Sir Thomas N. Redington says it does in some places in Ireland."

The fight for national schools, then, is not with the Roman Catholic as an individual, but with the Roman Catholic Church and its arrogant claim, as stated by Mr. Gladstone, that in the conflict of laws, civil and ecclesiastical, the ecclesiastical commands must prevail.

STIMULATING THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CONSCIENCE.

It is only natural that "convictions" thus imposed ready-made upon the adherents of the Roman Catholic church, and not

necessarily springing from the source of conscience, should require a good deal of stimulus from time to time. In January, 1871, for instance, the Roman Catholic Bishop of London, Ontario, felt constrained to conclude his pastoral letter by ordaining in the name of God that "no Catholic parent living within the legal limits of a separate school, shall send his children to mixed or common schools, they being adjudged by the Canadian hierarchy as dangerous to faith and morals. Should any Catholic parent unfortunately persist in violating this ordinance, he shall be refused the Holy Sacraments until such time as they shall consent to obey the church in this matter." Archbishop Cleary's brimstone utterances five years ago have not yet disappeared from the public mind. In the pastoral letter of the archbishops and bishops of the ecclesiastical provinces of Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa, in April, 1891, the clergy, secular and regular, and the faithful of the provinces were reminded "of the true doctrine concerning the control of the church over the education of the Catholic children in schools," and told that in Manitoba "they are trying once more an underhand and satanic prosecution against the rights of the church," that the Archbishop of St. Boniface has raised his voice against "this iniquity," has made known the "perfidious stratagem," and has allowed his flock to "see how odious it is." This shows that the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Canada is not far behind that of the United States in appealing to the adherents of the church to vindicate their "liberty of conscience," and put down the public school system. If they keep on we may hope to see the Canadian Roman Catholic conscience stimulated by words like these of Priest Phelan, uttered at a St. Louis convention on Oct. 17th, 1873:

"The children of the public schools turn out to be learned horse thieves, scholastic counterfeits. The Catholics would as soon send their children into a pest house or bury them, as let them go to public schools. They were afraid the child who left home in the morning, would come back with something in his heart as black as hell."

Similarly Bishop Baltes, of Alton, in his Lenten pastoral of 1870, calls the public schools "seminaries of infidelity and fruitful sources of immorality." Thus it is that frenzied invective and the refusal of the Sacrament are brought into play to compel the Roman Catholic individual to entertain the "conscientious convictions" with which otherwise he would have little sympathy.

CHURCH AND STATE.

It will be easily seen then, that the question is whether the church or state is to control in matters of education. Mr. Gladstone long ago clearly perceived this. "All other christian bodies," he said, "are content with freedom in their own religious domain ; Orientals, Lutherans, Calvinists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Nonconformists, one and all in the present day, contentedly and thankfully accept the benefits of civil order ; never pretend that the state is not its own master ; make no religious claims to temporal possessions or advantages ; and consequently, never are in perilous collision with the state. Nay more, even so, I believe it is with the mass of Roman Catholics individually. But not so with the leaders of their church, or with those who take pride in following the leaders."

Does the fact that the Roman Catholic church has decreed that its doctrines must be taught as a part of our public school system necessitate our teaching them there ? Must the state impose doctrinal teaching upon the public because the Roman Catholic church has so commanded it, and its adherents dare not disobey ? If so, what can the church command that the state must not obey, and where is the boasted supremacy of the state over the church in matters of civil concern ? The church, as such, it has been said, has nothing to do with the state but to obey its laws and strengthen its moral foundations ; the state has nothing to do with the church except to protect her in her property and liberty. These are the relations between church and state of which modern civilization has approved. Either they must continue to exist, or we must bow submissively to Pope Pius IX and his condemnation of all who assign to the state the power of defining the civil rights and province of the church.

INDIVIDUAL CONSCIENCE AND THE LAW.

But even if it were a matter of conscientious conviction with the Roman Catholic that he should be allowed to inculcate his religious doctrines to the fullest extent through the medium of the public schools, must these convictions take form in our educational system ? In 1878 the United States Supreme Court was required to decide what is meant by religious liberty under the American constitution. Reynolds, a Mormon, charged with bigamy, sought to defend himself by proving that he was a Mormon and "that the members of the church believe that the

practice of polygamy was directly enjoined upon the male members thereof by Almighty God, in a revelation to Joseph Smith, the founder and prophet of said church," and that disobedience would be punished by "damnation in the life to come." A stronger case of religious conviction could not probably be adduced, and yet Chief Justice Waite, while admitting this, delivered judgment in the Supreme Court as follows :

"Laws are made for the government of actions, and while they cannot interfere with mere religious belief and opinions, they may with practices. Suppose one believed that human sacrifices were a necessary part of religious worship, would it be seriously contended that the civil government under which he lived could not interfere to prevent sacrifice. Or, if a wife religiously believed that it was her duty to burn herself upon the funeral pile of her dead husband, would it be beyond the power of the civil government to prevent her carrying her belief into practice? So here, as a law of the organization of society under the exclusive dominion of the United States, it is provided that plural marriages shall not be allowed. Can a man excuse his practices to the contrary because of his religious belief? To permit this would be to make the profound doctrines of religious belief superior to the law of the land, and in effect to permit every citizen to become a law unto himself. Government would exist only in name under such circumstances."

The instance given fully illustrates the principles upon which the modern state is formed, and to which its success is largely due.

FACE THE REAL FACTS

The conscience plea cannot bear examination. The fact is that the Roman Catholic Church, which is probably the richest, the most powerful, and the most determined in the world, long ago concluded to teach its doctrines in the public schools for the double purpose of spreading Roman Catholic doctrines and preventing Roman Catholics from drifting into Protestantism, or becoming indifferent to the hierarchy and their doctrines. For this reason the so-called conscience plea was made a dogma of the church, so that it might be enforced upon its flock by a free use of all the terrors of anathema and excommunication. That conscience is in no way concerned is clearly shown by the elasticity it manifests wherever the priesthood finds it difficult to enforce its so-called dictates, as in the United States, Australia, and the many other countries already mentioned.

CHAPTER XI.

NO. 2. THE TREATY ARGUMENT. THE HIERARCHY AND THE REBELLION OF 1869-70. A CHAPTER LEFT OUT OF MR. EWART'S BOOK.

The second argument advanced from the Roman Catholic side is that they are entitled to separate schools by treaty. This will be fully dealt with in a subsequent chapter, but first a word or two on the Riel rebellion may not be out of place. According to Mr. Ewart who devotes some eighty pages of his book to the discussion of these two questions, the rebellion was caused chiefly by what Lord Dufferin styled "the somewhat precipitate attempts made in the year 1869 to incorporate the present Province of Manitoba with the Dominion before the conditions of the proposed union had been explained to its inhabitants." A quarter of a century has now elapsed since the rebellion of 1869-70, and it hardly seems necessary to a proper understanding of the Manitoba School question to resurrect the details relating to that unfortunate period in our history. There is one chapter, however, which Mr. Ewart has left out of his narration. I allude to the part which was generally supposed to have been taken by Mr. Ewart's clients, the Roman Catholic hierarchy in the first Riel Rebellion.

In 1870 the "Correspondence relative to the recent disturbances in the Red River settlement" was presented to both houses of the British Parliament by command of Her Majesty. It was printed in due course in book form. On page seven of this correspondence will be found an affidavit in which it is stated with reference to those who formed the barrier at the river Salle and prevented Mr. McDougall from entering the country:—"Among other houses in the vicinity where certain of the forty men at the River Salle are billeted, ten of the armed party find quarters at the house of the Cure, Rev. Pere Ritchot."

On page eight Col. Dennis reports that gentlemen whom he met in the settlement were opposed to a conflict with the French party "backed as they would be by the Roman Catholic church, which appears probable by the course at present being taken by the priests."

Further down the same page he reports: "Mr. — has just come in, and reports that about eighty of the French party who are opposed to the views of the insurgents, met by invitation at

the camp of the disaffected to day, but that their remonstrances and appeals to get them to disband were entirely without avail. Several persons were present, among others Pere Lestanc, the Father Superior. Pere Lestanc took little or no part in the proceedings one way or another; some of the others were less scrupulous, Pere Richot declaring in favor of the stand taken, and called upon the insurgents to maintain their ground. The appeals of this priest, and of the leaders of the insurgent party, had the effect of even withdrawing, then and there, some twenty or thereabouts, of Mr. Dease's party over to their side."

In a note, it is added that "another leader of the Dease party testifies that on this occasion the priest raved and tore his gown, addressing the assemblage in the most frantic and excited manner."

On page nine will be found the following memorandum respecting a visit made by someone whose name is not disclosed to the White Horse Plains:—

Tuesday Evening, October 26, 1869.

"Came from the road—from Magan's, Buston's, and go to bring the horse from the church to the water. The nuns see him water his horse; they run to him and ask him "Did you come from St. Vital," they said to him "to join the people? and do not let the Governor cross the lines or come into the country—he will speak and say many things to please you, fill his mouth with sugar, but he will do you much harm when he gets in." They told the people to get their arms and take them with them, supplied them with provisions, bags of pemmican, etc., They got arms from Cowley—about twenty eight or forty people. Priest Cabina spoke against letters to Buston, saying that Sherman wanted to blind the people. Note,— knows about this—ask him. Heard the priests and nuns declare, both, that the Bishop had sent letters from Canada, that the Governor was not to be allowed to come into the Territory."

On page 18 Col. Dennis reports on date 28th October:—
"Judge Black has just called to say that the Governor failed, after some three hours interview with Pere Ritchot, to bring him and his party to reason."

Further down on the same page he adds "—'Messrs. Fraser and Sutherland have called, bringing the accompanying note from Dr. Cowan. These gentlemen state that, on their visiting the Insurgent camp, they were met by Pere Ritchot, who took them into a private room in his own house, in part of which was the Chapel, and, declining for a long time to bring them face to face with the leaders in this movement, used every effort to persuade them that it would be impossible to get them to withdraw from the stand they had taken. The gentlemen insisted, however, and at

length were shown by the Priest upstairs in the same building to what he termed the committee room. Here were sitting, in a very formal way, the Committee consisting of ten members. The gentlemen announced the purpose of their visit; but were told that no business would be done in the absence of the chairman, who came in shortly afterwards, and proved to be the man formerly mentioned, named John Bruce. Messrs. Fraser and Sutherland then proceeded to put several questions as to the objects and purposes of the party. Not a single reply could be obtained to any of these, and at length it became difficult for them to get a hearing at all; it seeming as if the leaders Bruce and Riel—the latter also being in the room—were afraid to allow these gentlemen to speak, for fear their arguments might lead to a defection in their camp. Mr. William Hallett was also present, and commenced addressing the committee, most of the members being well known to him, in the Indian language, but they refused to allow him to go on, the voice of the priest being heard from the room below, where he had been evidently listening to the proceedings, calling out, "Why do you not speak in French?" After spending the whole day there to no purpose, Messrs. Fraser and Sutherland returned."

On page 22 is printed a communication from Winnipeg to Mr. McDougall by anonymous friends of the Canadian Government in which they say:—"the actual number of the disaffected do not exceed 250 men, all told, and the slightest opposition would reduce that number to the original 40, including the priests at their head."

A private letter on page 27 contains this passage:—"the camp (Insurgent) is daily attended by one or more of the Roman Catholic clergy."

On page 39 Colonel Dennis in describing a meeting of the council on the 16th Nov., 1869, says:—"Priest O'Donohue at one time became very much excited, and quoted the wrongs of Ireland, and stated that the British Government was now shaking to its foundation."

On page 49 under the heading "Notes by J. W. between the 4th and 22nd November, 1869" occurs the following, "Mr. — a wealthy half-breed, and strongly opposed to the priests, says that soldiers should be sent in immediately to save the country."

On page 119 in the evidence of Charles Garrett on the prosecution of Rev. Father Ritchot and Alfred Scott on the charge of being accessory to the murder of Thomas Scott the following occurs:—"On the 7th December last, I saw Father Ritchot very actively directing the actions of the insurgents at the arrest of prisoners at Dr. Schultz's house. I was pretty far off at the time, but I recognized him. Dr. Schultz, Dr. Lynch, Dr. Darling and

Mr. Hamilton were among the arrested. About forty or fifty were arrested."

On page 155 Donald A. Smith, now Sir Donald A. Smith, says that on hearing that Scott was irrevocably sentenced to death the Rev. George Young "was paralyzed with horror, returned to the prisoner and immediately sent a messenger to inform me of the result of his visit." He adds:—"I determined to find out Riel immediately, but recollecting that Pere Lestanc was still upstairs with Mr. McTavish, went to him, related what I heard, and asked him if he knew anything about the matter. His answer I cannot give in precise words, but it was to the effect that they had seen Mr. Riel on the other side (St. Boniface), and had all spoken to him about it, by which I understood that they had interceded for Scott. Governor McTavish was greatly shocked on being informed of Riel's purpose, and joined in repudiating it. Pere Lestanc consented to accompany me, and we called on Riel. When we entered he asked me, "What news from Canada." The mail had arrived the preceding day, and I replied, "Only the intelligence that Bishop Tache will be here very soon." I then mentioned what I had heard regarding Scott, and before Riel answered, Pere Lestanc interposed in French words, meaning "is there no way of escape?" Riel replied to him, "my Rev. Pere, you know exactly how the matter stands," then turning to me, he said, etc."

On page 152 in the report of Mr. Donald A. Smith, the Canadian Commissioner, the following passages occur:—"The well affected French party became aware of what had happened, and not believing in Riel's good faith, determined to prevent the papers from falling into his hands. They got together some sixty or eighty men, who met my friend on his way back and were escorting him, when on the 18th, about ten miles from the Fort, they were accosted by Riel and some of his party, and by the Rev. Mr. Ritchot. An altercation took place, Riel attempted to use his pistol, saying; "he would not be taken alive in his own country," on which a revolver was levelled at his head, and Mr. Ritchot having interposed, he was unceremoniously told to stand aside and "not to interfere any further with matters unconnected with his spiritual duties." It may be well to note that all those who took part in this affair were Catholics, and, with one or two exceptions, French half-breeds."

And the following:—"He at once removed the guard, and we went up to the party who had just arrived. Messrs. Riel and O'Donoghue, with a few of their friends, were present, and vehemently protested against the action now being taken, while the ex-councillors accused them of treason to the Imperial Crown, and of using every effort to bring about the annexation of the

country to the United States. Riel replied "that was only supposing the people desired it, but that he was willing the question should be submitted to them." Pere Lestanc spoke warmly in favor of the "President," who, he said had acted so as to merit the gratitude of his countrymen, and begged them still to put confidence in him. This evidently had no effect, and ultimately, after a good deal of recrimination, it was arranged that a meeting of the inhabitants from all parts of the settlement should be called for the morrow, the 19th, at which the papers bearing on the subject should be read, a guard of forty men remaining in the house to ensure the safe-keeping of the documents.

Riel's men were now falling away from him, while the loyal party expressed their determination no longer to be guided in the matter either by him or by Pere Lestanc and his associates. They were full of hope, and confident that the following day would bring with it complete success to the cause of Canada.

Late that night Pere Lestanc paid them another visit, which was prolonged for several hours beyond midnight, and next morning it was found that a majority of those who had seceded from Riel were again on friendly terms with him."

And this on page 153:—"At this meeting, and that held the following day, the reading of the Commission, the Queen's Letter, and every other document was contested with much obstinacy, but ultimately carried; and threats were used to myself in the presence and hearing of the Chairman, of the Secretary, Judge Black, and others, more especially by Mr. Riel and Rev. Mr. Lestanc. At the commencement of the meeting I requested the Chairman and those near him to begin by insisting that all arms should be laid down, and that the flag then flying (fleur-de-lis and sham-rocks) should be replaced by the British ensign; this, they thought would come better at an after-stage; but the opportunity of doing so, now lost, never recurred."

On page 140 the Hon. Mr. McDougal who was kept informed continually of everything that transpired at Winnipeg during the period of the trouble is reported as saying during the debate in the House of Commons at Ottawa;—"In looking over the map of the new Province laid on the table, he noticed that an important Canadian settlement, naming Portage la Prairie, had been left beyond the limits of the Province, though the boundary line diverged fifteen minutes to take in a small settlement marked on the map "Roman Catholic Mission." It was just as well there should be a little plain speaking on this point at an early day. It was known by the Government and the country that the rebellion in the Northwest originated with the Roman Catholic priesthood. ("No, No," from French members.) That fact was substantiated by the Commissioners of the Government who had been sent to that country. The priesthood desired to secure certain

advantages for themselves, their Church or their people. And they advised their people to take the course they did. These facts could be proved beyond doubt if the House would grant a committee of inquiry."

It will be remembered by those who have read Mr. Ewart's book that throughout the eighty pages of Part III which is devoted to a discussion of "The Manitoba Act as a Treaty," denunciations without number are heaped upon the Canadian Government for causing the rebellion of 1869-70. The people of the Red River, on the contrary, are represented as so many Hampdens who rose in justifiable revolt to vindicate their rights as British subjects. Strange to say throughout the narration, nothing is said of the actions of the Rev. Pere Lestanc, the Father Superior, the Rev. Father Ritchot, or Priest O'Donohue and the rest of the hierarchy in connection with the achievements of 1869 and the following year. With singular modesty, Mr. Ewart appears willing to give all the glory to the late Mr. Riel and his associates, quite ignoring the claims of his clients in that connection. The chapter which might have revealed the figure of the priest behind so many stirring events has been left out.

We are told however, (pg. 387) that "this rebellion was not against Her Majesty, the Queen, or British sovereignty."

It need hardly be said that this statement is open to serious question. In the course of his report Mr. Donald A. Smith says:—

"The state of matters at this time in and around Fort Garry was most unsatisfactory and truly humiliating. Upwards of sixty British subjects were held in close confinement as political prisoners; security for person or property there was none; the Fort, with its large supplies and ammunition, provisions and stores of all kinds, was in the possession of a few hundred French half-breeds, whose leaders had declared their determination to use every effort for the purpose of annexing the territory to the United States; and the Governor and Council of Assiniboia was powerless to enforce the law."

The leaders of the French half-breeds who were in the ascendant had declared for annexation to the United States, and as has been shown above the request of Mr. Donald A. Smith, one of the Canadian delegates, "that the flag then flying (fleur-de-lis and shamrocks) should be replaced by the British ensign" before he should read his commission and the Queen's letter to the great mass meeting which preceded the Convention of Forty was refused. These facts at any rate do not help to establish Mr.

Ewart's contention or to indicate that the dominant party was consumed by feelings of loyalty to Great Britain.

Many and strong arguments can be advanced to justify in a measure the first Riel rebellion. In elaborating its attractive features, however, it is just possible to forget that there were ugly features as well. The great extent to which it was priest-made, the open advocacy of annexation and the death of Scott are some of these.

CHAPTER XII.

NO. 2.—THE TREATY ARGUMENT—THE "PARLIAMENTARY COMPACT" ABSURDITY—AN INTERESTING PHOTOGRAPH AND SOME HITHERTO UNPUBLISHED FACTS ABOUT BILL OF RIGHTS NO. 4.

A great deal has been said and written about the alleged treaty rights of the Roman Catholic minority to separate schools. It is claimed that before the people of Red River consented to acknowledge the sovereignty of the Dominion a bill of rights was drawn up in which among other things, a demand for separate schools was made as a condition precedent to their entry into the union, and that this demand was acceded to by the Dominion Government. In this way, it is argued, the Roman Catholic minority are entitled to separate schools as a matter of treaty right, a right which was afterwards crystallized into legislation by section 22 of the Manitoba Act.

To understand in what light this contention is to be regarded it is necessary to hark back to December, 1869. After the ineffectual efforts made by the Hon. Wm. McDougall and Col. Dennis to enter the Red River territory, the Dominion Government determined on sending delegates to the country to inquire into and report "on the cause of the discontent and dissatisfaction at the proposed changes, which now exist there; also to explain to the inhabitants the principles upon which the Government of Canada intend to govern the country, and remove any misapprehension which may exist on the subject."

THE CANADIAN DELEGATES AND THE CONVENTION OF FORTY.

The delegates chosen were the Very Reverend Grand Vicar Thibault, Col. de Salaberry, and Mr. Donald A. Smith, and their instructions were dated in the early part of December 1869. The Vicar General arrived at Fort Garry on December 26th, Mr. Smith on the day following, and Col. de Salaberry on the 6th of January, 1870. The errand of the Vicar General and Col. de Salaberry seems to have been merely "to calm the French half-breeds," while upon Mr. Smith devolved the duty of explaining the principles upon which the Canadian Government would govern the country. Mr. Smith refused at the outset to deal with Riel's "Provisional Government," and insisted upon meeting the people

of the country and explaining his mission to them. Mr. Ewart professes to be surprised at this very proper conduct on Mr. Smith's part, but adds "nevertheless he had his way, and a mass meeting of the settlers was called for, and held on the 19th January." (Mr. Ewart p. 348.) Upwards of a thousand people attended; "so many were present that the assembly had to be held in the open air, and this when the thermometer stood at about 20 degrees below zero. The meeting lasted some five hours." (Begg p. 22.) Mr. Smith having explained his commission to the meeting a resolution was carried providing for the appointment of twenty representatives of the English population to meet twenty representatives of the French population on the 25th of the same month "with the object of considering Mr. Smith's commission, and to decide what would be best for the welfare of the country." (Mr. Ewart p. 348.) These forty representatives were afterwards elected and met on the 25th of January and continued in session till the 10th of February. They have since been known as the "Council of Forty." After an opening address by Mr. Smith a committee of six was appointed to draw up a list of rights. The list was subsequently discussed clause by clause in a debate which lasted from the 29th of January to the 3rd of February. On the 7th of February at eleven o'clock in the morning the list of rights was placed in Mr. Smith's hands with an intimation that the Convention would be ready to hear his answer two hours afterwards. At the appointed hour Mr. Smith returned the list of rights with such answers as he felt at liberty to make to the various demands. "A large majority of the delegates" says Mr. Smith, "expressed entire satisfaction with the answers to their 'List of Rights,' and professed confidence in the Canadian Government to which I invited them to send delegates, with the view of effecting a speedy transfer of the territory to the Dominion, an invitation received with acclamation and unanimously accepted." Subsequently the same committee (with the exception of one name) which had been appointed to draw up a bill of rights, was reappointed to discuss and decide "on the basis of details of the Provisional Government, which we have agreed is to be formed for Rupert's Land and the North-West Territories," A "Provisional Government" of 24 members was decided upon, with Riel as President and

THE THREE RED RIVER DELEGATES.

Mr. Thomas Bunn, Secretary. The President, Riel, then nominated as delegates to Canada Rev. Mr. Ritchot, about whose connection with the rebellion a good deal has been said in the preceding chapter. John Black, Esq., Recorder, and Mr. Alfred H. Scott, who had been prominently associated with the movement to bring about the annexation of Rupert's Land to the United States. The election of members of the Council or Legislative Assembly took place on the 26th of February, the Assembly met on the 9th of March and remained in session until the 26th of the same month, during which the constitution of the Provisional Government was drawn up.

THE DELAY OF THE DELEGATES AND INTERFERENCE BY THE RIEL GOVERNMENT.

But in the meantime the delegates to Ottawa who were to have left on their mission after the adjournment of the Council of Forty on the 10th of February had been detained at home by the renewed difficulties caused by the arrival of Major Boulton and his party of loyalists from Portage la Prairie, and did not leave Fort Garry until the 23rd of March. Had they left at the time appointed no question could have arisen as to the bill of rights which they carried with them; it would most assuredly have been the list prepared by the Convention of Forty. The great delay however enabled the new Provisional Government which met on the 9th of March to prepare a fresh bill of rights, and it was claimed on behalf of the Roman Catholic minority that even after that again another list of rights was prepared by the executive of the Provisional Government at the last moment, which was carried by the delegates to Ottawa and made the basis of the negotiations which led to the passage of the Manitoba Act.

BILL OF RIGHTS NO. 1.

During the troubles of 1869-70 at Red River it is well known that three separate bills of rights were prepared. The first was that of December 1st, 1869, which was adopted by the Council of Twenty Four, and which the Hon. Wm. McDougall was to be compelled to agree to as a condition precedent to entering the Red River territory. It contained thirteen clauses. This list of rights was in due course forwarded by Mr. McDougall to the

Canadian Government. It contained no reference whatever to schools except the following:—"6. A portion of the public lands to be appropriated for the benefit of Schools, the building of Roads and Parish Buildings." This is Bill of Rights number one. (See the four Bills of Rights appendix D).

BILL OF RIGHTS No. 2.

The second list of rights was that of the Council of Forty. It consisted of twenty sections. Although drawn up by the Council and adopted after a debate extending from the 29th of January to the 3rd of February, it, like Bill of Rights No. 1, contained no reference to schools or education except the following:—"That, while the Northwest remains a territory, the sum of \$25,000 a year be appropriated for schools, roads and bridges." (See appendix D).

BILL OF RIGHTS No. 3.

The letter of instructions which accompanied the third Bill of Rights is dated March 22rd, 1870, the day before the delegates left for Ottawa, and in the Bunn papers is a copy of this bill in French, dated March 23rd, 1870, the very day Messrs. Ritchot and Scott started out on their journey. The reasons for believing that this bill was carried to Ottawa by the delegates would seem to be conclusive; they are as follows:—

(1.) A copy of it was found amongst the papers of the late Thomas Bunn, Secretary of Riel's Provisional Government, in a file labelled "Delegation to Canada, Copies of Commissions and Letters of Instructions." (See letter of James Taylor to the Manitoba Free Press Jan. 15th, 1890.)

(2.) Copies of this bill of rights were printed in the French language and circulated amongst the French people of the Red River settlement on the day the delegates left for Ottawa as copies of the demands to be made by the delegates. Mr. Bunn's papers and one of these copies are now preserved in the Provincial library.

(3.) Mr. Begg in his history gives this list as the one which was taken to Ottawa by the delegates. Begg's "Creation of Manitoba," (1871) p. 325.

(4.) In his dispatch to the Earl of Granville dated 29th April 1870, while the negotiations were in progress, Sir John Young, then Governor-General of Canada, says:—"I think it right to forward to your Lordship a copy of the terms and conditions brought by the Delegates from the Northwest, which have formed the sub-

ject of conference." This dispatch and the list mentioned by Sir John Young will be found on pages 129 and 130 of "Correspondence relative to the Recent Disturbances in the Red River Settlement," presented to both houses of the Imperial Parliament by command of Her Majesty in August 1870. This list given by Sir John Young is the same as that found in Mr. Bunn's papers. When Mr. Ewart's book was written the existence of this dispatch was not generally known, nor was it referred to during the argument on the Referred Case before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It would seem to remove even the possibility of controversy and to prove beyond all doubt that Bill No. 3, of which a copy was found amongst Mr. Bunn's papers was the one taken to Ottawa by the delegates. I have already pointed out that Bills No. 1 and 2 contained no demand for separate schools or denominational privileges of any kind. In Bill No. 3 no reference of any sort to schools is to be found. (See Bill No. 3 Appendix D.)

BILL OF RIGHTS, NO. 4 (ALLEGED).

The origin of the alleged Bill of Rights No. 4 is in many ways most mysterious. Its publication by the late Archbishop Tache in the Manitoba Free Press on the 27th of December, 1889, caused no small sensation amongst the old settlers and those who had made any study of the events of 1869-70. On the 7th of January following Mr. James Taylor, custodian of the papers of the late Thomas Bunn, Secretary of the Provisional Government, wrote to the Free Press denying the genuineness of Bill No. 4 and insisting that Bill No. 3 was the one taken to Ottawa by the delegates. In replying to Mr. Taylor the Archbishop admitted that Bill of Rights No. 4 had never been published "until a few days ago," although twenty years had intervened since the negotiations of 1870. He further stated that Bill No. 3 had "never been published." In this however, His Grace was mistaken as (1) copies of Bill No. 3 were distributed through the settlement on the day the delegates left for Ottawa; (2) it was printed at length in 1870 in the Imperial blue book before referred to which contained the correspondence relative to the rebellion, and (3) it was also printed in full in Beggs "Creation of Manitoba." The Archbishop added:—"You may say this is new information; to many it is, but not to me. You may also add it is not satisfactory; granted but it is well known that the executives of governments, legal or,

illegal, do not always publish their actions; it is very seldom that the instructions to delegates are made public, especially in excited times and troublesome negotiations." The obvious rejoinder is that in this instance, as just stated, copies of the list of rights were printed and circulated on the day the delegates left, it was also published in the Imperial blue book in August of the same year, and next year in Mr. Begg's history. The twenty long years of silence with regard to Bill No. 4 can hardly be explained then on the theory that the "executives of governments" do not publish their actions.

According to Mr. Ewart :—"The best and only direct evidence that has been adduced upon the subject, is the sworn testimony of the Rev. Mr. Ritchot (himself one of the delegates), who was called as a witness when Lepine was being tried for the murder of Scott (1874), and when no one could have had any object in misstating the facts. At that trial Mr. Ritchot produced list No. 4, and swore that it was the list given to him as a delegate." Unfortunately for this argument the original bill produced by Rev. Father Ritchot on the Lepine trial has entirely disappeared. It is also somewhat remarkable that the only reference to Rev. Father Ritchot's evidence in the court record at Winnipeg is contained on a sheet of paper pasted into the record book. I mention this merely as a fact requiring explanation.

Mr. Ewart proceeds :—"Internal evidence, too, is not wanting in support of Mr. Ritchot's statement. Paragraph 1 of list No. 4 demands a senate for the new province, and a senate was granted, although the expense of it was much objected to. List No. 3 says nothing about a Senate. Again, List No. 4 (paragraph 7) demands "that the schools be separate," and clauses were inserted to that end in the Manitoba Act. List No. 3 says nothing about schools." Internal evidence of this kind, without something more, cannot carry much weight. It could be adduced to show that the clauses of the Bill were taken from the Manitoba Act, just as well as to prove that the provisions of the Act were based upon the Bill.

Mr. Ewart again proceeds :—"Other evidence of very strong character, may be added : After much consultation between Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George Cartier, on the one hand, and the Rev. Mr. Ritchot and Judge Black on the other, a draft bill was submitted to the delegates as that which the government was prepared to concede. The Rev. Mr. Ritchot made obser-

vations in writing upon all the clauses in the draft and sent them to the ministers. Section 19 of the draft dealt with the schools, and the following are the observations made upon it by Mr. Ritchot :

“Cette clause etant la meme que celle de l’Acte de l’Amerique Britannique du Nord, confere, je l’interprete ainsi, comme principe fundamental, le privilege des ecoles separees dans toute la plentitude et, en cela, est conforme a l’article 7 de nos instructions.”

“(This clause being the same as the British North America Act, confers, so I interpret it, as fundamental principle, the privilege of separate schools to the fullest extent, and in that is in conformity with article 7 of our instructions.)”

The Rev. Father Ritchot has something to say with regard to these “observations in writing” made by him in the following statement furnished to the late Archbishop and published by the latter in the Free Press in January 1890 in answer to Mr. Taylor :—

“ST. BONIFACE, Jan. 13th, 1890.

“To His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface.

“MONSEIGNEUR,—I positively affirm that the articles of the List of Rights, which you have published in the Free Press of the 27th December last, and in the Manitoba of the 31st, are exactly similar to the correspondent articles of the List of Rights which has been finally handed to me, as well as to my co-delegate, when we started for Ottawa. That list was the only basis of our negotiations and it contained in 2nd of the 1st article the demand of a Senate or Upper House and the 7th article referred to the separate schools and we have obtained both.

It is easy for anyone to make sure of what I say here, by consulting the “Remarks” I have drawn on the 28th and 29th April, 1870, during the negotiations. I herewith give to Your Grace the original of the same and at the time I gave a copy to both Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George Cartier.

Permit me, My Lord, to observe that I have not seen in Your Grace’s publication the 20th article of our List of Rights, though the article existed. You may look at my papers and you will find that the article is mentioned in No. 6 of the “general observations” which follow the “Remarks” to which I have just alluded above.

Deign, Monseigneur, accept the homage of my entire and respectful devotedness.

(Signed)

N. J. RITCHOT.

Priest.”

REV. FATHER RITCHOT'S "REMARKS."

These "Remarks" of Rev. Father Ritchot's have frequently been referred to in connection with the Manitoba Schools controversy. Through the courtesy of the authorities of the Archbishop's palace at St. Boniface I was recently permitted to examine the book in which they are contained. They are written on sheets of blue foolscap pasted into the book which served Rev. Father Ritchot as a diary while the negotiations at Ottawa were in progress. They are not a portion of the diary itself; according to Rev. Father Ritchot's certificate written in the book, the journal ends at page 56, while the "Remarks" are pasted in on subsequent pages. There is a very obvious peculiarity about the date of this document. This portion of it struck me as being so extraordinary that on a second visit on the 9th of September I had a photograph taken of the first page of the "Remarks" in which this date appears. The following photograph is from the photograph :—

DATE OF THE "REMARKS"—AN INTERESTING PHOTOGRAPH.

Resonance sur 26.5 ans

28 au 29 April 1878

Le nom de *Manitoba* signifie
approprié, et il semble de plus en plus qu'il lui
convient d'adopter pour son nom la première Ma-
nue qui a le projet de former
une autre portion du territoire des
Ojibwés qui ont beaucoup de
des rangs et les implément

Le projet de ^{constitution} former une
Ojibwa Province du territoire
compris entre la ligne frontière
Nord et le 53^e degré de latitude
au Nord d'entre le 96^e degré de
longitude à l'Est et le 98^e 30 minutes
de longitude à l'Est (au ^{contour} enroulant
c'est à dire passer par le lac
Long en passant aux premiers habitations
des fermiers français des parties du
la Province

REV. FATHER RITCHOT'S DILEMMA.

It is somewhat remarkable that although Mr. Ewart and others have so often referred to these "Remarks," no one has made the

slightest reference to the alteration in their date. It is difficult to understand how anyone even glancing at the pages of the 'Remarks' could fail to perceive the very manifest alteration which has taken place in the figures denoting the year when they were supposed to have been made. If, as Rev. Father Ritchot states, these 'Remarks' were made while the negotiations were in progress, he will most certainly have to explain why the document appears to have been originally dated 1873, and subsequently altered by writing a cypher heavily over the original figure. He will not be helped in his explanation by the fact that the original figure 3 is in faded ink like the figures 187— preceding it, while the cypher is in much fresher and blacker ink.

So much for the evidence adduced to show that Bill No. 4 is the one taken to Ottawa by the delegates. Contrasted with the evidence in support of Bill No. 3, it cannot be said to carry much weight. It would be difficult to suggest much stronger evidence than that which has been adduced in favor of Bill No. 3 or much weaker evidence than that which has been produced in favor of Bill No. 4. I am of course commenting merely on the evidence so far as it is known at present. It certainly seems to be fatal to Rev. Father Ritchot and Bill No. 4, the only list of rights which is said to have contained any allusion to separate schools, and to have demanded guarantees for the continuation of any denominational rights or privileges to the Roman Catholic minority.

The first step taken to show that separate schools were guaranteed to the Roman Catholics by treaty, was the advancement of the contention that they were demanded by Bill of Rights No. 4. I have just gone over the evidence on this point, and to put it mildly, it is not satisfactory. The next argument put forward by the advocates of the treaty idea is that the bill of rights taken to Ottawa—whether it was No. 3 or No. 4—was made the basis of negotiations there. Rev. Father Ritchot in his letter quoted in a previous paragraph says:—"That list (No. 4) was the only basis of our negotiations." In this, unfortunately for Rev. Father Ritchot again, his statements are absolutely at variance with those of the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald, whose evidence on this point is printed on page 101 of appendix 6 of the Journals of the House of Commons of Canada of 1874—being the report of the select committee on the causes of the

difficulties in the North-West Territory in 1869-70. Sir John deposed as follows:—

SIR JOHN A. MACDONALD'S EVIDENCE.

"Sir George Cartier and I had been appointed, I think, by Order in Council, to represent the Government in dealing with these delegates.

Judge Black and Father Ritchot met Sir George and myself at Sir George's house. Mr. Scott was absent from some accidental cause. They presented themselves as delegates appointed at a meeting of the people at Winnipeg. They presented a resolution or resolutions passed at that meeting.

Judge Black took me aside and stated that they had received and brought with them an authority from Riel, as Chief of the Provisional Government, to act on behalf of that Provisional Government, and also a certain claim, or a Bill of Rights, prepared by that Government. He asked me what was to be done with the authority and the "Bill of Rights." I told him they had better not be produced, as the Governor-General could not recognize the legal existence of the Provisional Government, and would not treat with them as such. I stated, however, that the claims asserted in the last mentioned Bill of Rights could be pressed by the delegates, and would be considered on their own merits.

I understood from Sir George that he made a similar communication to Father Ritchot. Conversations between Father Ritchot, Sir George and myself were conducted by Sir George, in consequence of Father Ritchot's want of knowledge of English and mine of French.

After Judge Black and I returned to the room, we spoke plainly of the matter, and it was understood that the discussion was between the delegates of the Convention and the Canadian Government, excluding any other capacity in which they appeared. We avoided as much as possible, speaking of the Provisional Government. Judge Black desired to be spoken of as coming from the Convention, and not from the Provisional Government. The conversation took place both in French and English. I could understand Father Ritchot at times when he spoke slowly. I arrived at my understanding from what I understood of his conversation myself, and the explanations I received from Sir George when I had difficulty in comprehending. Father Ritchot understood that we did not recognize them as representatives of the Provisional Government; but I understood from Sir George that Father Ritchot was continually anxious to obtain some such recognition, while Sir George was avoiding any such recognition."

FATHER RITCHOT CONTRADICTED AT EVERY POINT.

The above evidence given by Sir John A. Macdonald is a complete contradiction of the declarations of Rev. Father Ritchot. The latter states that the mysterious Bill of Rights, of the Provisional Government (No. 4) "was the only basis of our negotiations." The former deposes that :—

(1.) He told Judge Black not to produce his authority from Riel, or the Bill of Rights which the delegates had brought with them because "the Governor could not recognize the legal existence of the Provisional Government and would not treat with them as delegates of that government."

(2. He understood from Sir George Cartier that he had made a similar communication to Father Ritchot.

(3.) "Father Ritchot understood that we did not recognize them as representatives of the Provisional Government, but I understood from Sir George that Father Ritchot was continually anxious to obtain some such recognition, while Sir George was avoiding any such recognition."

(4.) "It was understood that the discussion was between the delegates of the Convention (of Forty) and the Canadian Government, excluding any other capacity in which they appeared."

(5.) The delegates presented themselves as delegates appointed at a meeting of the people at Winnipeg. They presented a resolution or resolutions passed at that meeting."

According to this statement Bill of Rights No. 4. instead of being "the only basis of our negotiations" was not a basis at all. As the Canadian Government refused to recognize the Provisional Government or any bill of rights emanating from it, it seems that Bill No. 3 could not have been accepted as a basis of negotiations either, as it also was prepared by the Provisional Government. The delegates were received, however, as representatives of the people of Winnipeg, and presented resolutions passed at the meeting at which they were appointed. Whether these resolutions included the list of rights adopted by the Convention of Forty at which the delegates were appointed, Sir John A. Macdonald did not say.

SETTLING THE DETAILS OF BILL NO. 2.

Speaking of the second bill of rights, prepared by the "Convention of Forty," the late Archbishop Tache himself said in a

letter in reply to Mr. Taylor, to which reference has before been made, "I know perfectly well that the general impression was that this bill of rights was the one given to the delegates to be used at Ottawa. Lord Dufferin himself was under that impression." In a despatch of December 10, 1874, Lord Dufferin expressed his views on this question forcibly enough. "An attempt," he said, "has been made to show that these delegates really held their appointment from Riel, and are to be considered as commissioned by his government. This, however, was not so; they were selected and the terms they were instructed to demand were settled before the election of Riel to the presidency." It might be gathered from the statement in the same letter—that the second bill of rights, though appended by Donald A. Smith to his report, was not handed to the delegates—that it could not have been the report which the Government at Ottawa considered. Lord Dufferin says it was the one considered. The late Archbishop himself was at one time a pretty good authority to the same effect. In his evidence on page 20 of Appendix 6 of the House of Commons Journals, 1874, he stated as follows:

"When I reached St. Paul I received intelligence of the Convention at Fort Garry," (the Convention of Forty) "and I telegraphed to Mr. Howe asking if they had heard of the Bill of Rights. He replied by telegram dated 25th Feb., 1870, as follows:

To the Right Rev. Bishop Tache:

"Bill of rights not yet received here; will telegraph and write you when I get it."

(Signed)

JOS. HOWE."

"I then telegraphed the Bill of Rights to Mr. Howe. I received in reply the telegram of 25th Feb., 1870, as follows:

OTTAWA, Feb. 25, 1870.

To Bishop Tache, St. Paul:

Proposition in the main satisfactory, but let the delegates come here to settle details."

(Signed)

JOSEPH HOWE."

This statement of the late Archbishop proves several very important facts. First, the bill of rights of "the settlers of Red

River," passed by the "Convention of Forty," was sent to the Government at Ottawa. Second, it was sent by the late Archbishop of St. Boniface himself. Third, it was in the main approved. Fourth, the delegates were invited to Ottawa to settle "the details" only. Fifth, there was nothing in any of its propositions either directly or remotely referring to separate schools or to the Quebec system of distributing school monies.

In fine, the list of rights of the Convention of Forty (Bill of Rights No. 2) was in the hands of the Government, having been telegraphed by Archbishop Tache. The delegates were asked to go to Ottawa to settle the details of Bill No. 2. In the natural order of things Bill No. 2 then would form the basis of negotiations, if negotiations were conducted on any settled basis. The despatch from the Governor-General to Earl Granville shows that the delegates took Bill No. 3 with them, but the evidence of Sir John A. Macdonald is that it was not accepted as a basis or recognized as an authoritative document in any way whatever. Bill No. 4 still maintains its most mysterious character. Even if it had been taken to Ottawa—and the evidence on that point is nearly all the other way—it could not have been made the basis of negotiations because, like No. 3, it would have been an emanation from the Provisional Government.

The next point necessary to notice in discussing this supposed treaty arrangement is, that the delegates from Winnipeg were not empowered to finally approve of the Manitoba Act or any other proposed arrangement. The only powers given them by the Convention of Forty are contained in the following resolution :—

"Resolved unanimously,—that as the Canadian Commissioners have invited a delegation from this country to Canada, to confer with the Canadian Government as to the affairs of this country; and as a cordial reception has been promised to said delegates, be it therefore resolved that the invitation be accepted, and that the same be signified to the Commissioners."

Their letter of instruction from the Provisional Government was as follows :—

Government House, Winnipeg,
Assiniboia.

To Alfred Scott, Esq.,

SIR,—Enclosed with this letter you will receive your commission and also a copy of the conditions and terms upon which the people of this country will consent to enter into the Confederation of Canada.

You will please proceed with convenient speed to the City of Ottawa, Canada, and on arriving there, you will, in company with the Rev. J. N. Ritchot and John Black, Esquire, put yourself immediately in communication with the Dominion Government on the subject of your commission.

You will please observe that, with regard to the articles numbered 1-2-3-4-5-6-7-15-17-19 and 20, you are left at liberty in concert with your fellow commissioners to exercise your discretion, but bear in mind, that as you carry with you the full confidence of this people, it is expected that in the exercise of this liberty you will do your utmost to secure their rights and privileges, which have hitherto been ignored.

With reference to the remaining articles, I am directed to inform you that they are peremptory.

I have further to inform you that you are not empowered to conclude finally any arrangements with the Canadian Government, but that any conclusions arrived at between you and the said Government must first be ratified by the Provisional Government before Assiniboia will become a province of the Confederation.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

THOS. BUNN,

Sec. of State.

March 22nd, 1870.

Not only were they not empowered by the Provisional Government to conclude finally any arrangements with the Canadian Government, but they were most expressly forbidden to do so. Any arrangement that they may have made cannot be binding upon any portion of Manitoba.

How the whole matter was regarded by the Canadian Government and the House of Commons will be evidenced by the following extracts from the debate on the proposed Manitoba Act on May 2nd 1870, as reported in the Ottawa Times of the fourth of the same month and in the Imperial correspondence before referred to. Sir Francis Hincks having stated that he had been in consultation with the delegates as to the terms of the bill, the following occurred :—

“Mr. Mackenzie—Then they saw the bill before we did.

Hon. Sir Francis Hincks—They have not seen it yet.”

And this :—“Mr. Godin asked if the constitution (Manitoba Act) was to be submitted to the people before being passed.

Hon. Sir George E. Cartier—No.”

The delegates had no power to approve of this so called treaty.

The people possessed any power that existed, but it was not intended to consult them in the matter.

Mr. Ewart's last argument in support of his treaty is that on Rev. Father Ritchot's return from Ottawa he explained the Manitoba Act at length to the Legislative Assembly or Council of the Provisional Government, and they agreed by resolution to enter Confederation on the terms therein contained. "The Rev. Mr. Ritchot," he says, "reached Fort Garry on the 17th June, and on the 24th a special session of the Legislative Assembly was held to hear his report. He had brought with him a copy of the Manitoba Act, which he explained at length to the members," and the members enthusiastically accepted it. (Mr. Ewart's book, p. 380.)

Mr. Ewart will admit that this is a matter on which Rev. Father Ritchot ought to be able to give the best evidence. If he will turn to page 81 of Appendix No. 6 of the House of Commons Journals of 1874, before referred to, he will find that Rev. Father Ritchot's evidence does not at all bear out the statement that the Manitoba Act was explained at length to the Legislative Assembly. The Reverend Father says:—"I went to Fort Garry to their ordinary hall, and there explained to them A FEW OF THE PROVISIONS of the Manitoba Act, and especially insisted on the question of amnesty, and recalled as much as possible all that had been told me on that subject." As Rev. Father Ritchot explained only "a few of the provisions" and it is not known which he did explain, it can hardly be contended that the Assembly knew anything about the provision with regard to separate schools, or accepted it in any way, or that they knew enough about the Act to indorse it in whole or in part as a treaty arrangement.

Besides this, Mr. Ewart fails to notice that a military expedition was sent to Manitoba on the heels of the Manitoba Act, the so-called treaty with the settlers of Red River. On this Mr. Taylor in his letter in reply to the late Archbishop Tache before referred to said:—"The word 'treaty' when applied to the Manitoba Act, is a misnomer. Your Grace is well aware that while we endeavored to enter into a treaty with the Federal Government in 1870—trying faithfully to get the very best terms for Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories our delegates were not loyal to our cause. The Ottawa authorities ignored our just requests, passed an act for the formation of a province embracing an area of only 9,500,000 square miles; provided a con-

stitution for that province ; appointed Hon. Adams G. Archibald its first governor, then ordered Col. Wolseley and his expedition to proceed to the newly formed province, and at the point of the bayonet forced the present constitution upon us, viz : The Manitoba Act, which has not been faithfully interpreted."

SUMMARY OF MR. EWART'S TREATY ARGUMENT.

Mr. Ewart thus can be said to have gone about this far in establishing his claim that separate schools were guaranteed to the people of Red River by treaty :—

(1.) Bill of Rights No. 1 formulated by the twenty-four delegates of the people in December 1869 reached the Government at Ottawa. But it did not ask for separate schools.

(2.) Bill of Rights No. 2 adopted by the Convention of Forty, the details of which the delegates were invited to Ottawa to settle, and which Lord Dufferin says was the basis of negotiations, did not ask for separate schools.

(3.) Bill of Rights No. 3 given by the Provisional Government to the delegates on the day they left for Ottawa asked no guarantee whatever as to schools.

(4.) Bill of Rights No. 4 is so mysterious in its origin and the evidence against its authenticity is so strong, that there will be no general verdict that it ever went to Ottawa at all. It is the only Bill which is said to have contained a demand for separate schools. If a bill containing such a demand ever reached Ottawa, the demand did not emanate from the people at large, or from the Convention of Forty which sent the delegates to Ottawa.

(5.) In any case no bill emanating from the Provisional Government was taken as the basis of negotiations. This is clear from the evidence of Sir John A. Macdonald.

(6.) The delegates were received as representatives of the people of the North-West, and Bill No. 2, according to Lord Dufferin, was the one considered. There was nothing in that bill about separate schools.

(7.) When the bill which afterwards became the Manitoba Act was put before the House of Commons Sir Francis Hincks for the Government gave the assurance that it had not up to that time been seen by the delegates. This would not have been the case if the Government regarded it as in any sense a treaty. As this statement was made on May 2nd, it is in order to know

how Rev. Father Ritchot made his note as to schools opposite section 19 of the draft bill in April 29th.

(8.) Parliament did not pass the act until Sir George Cartier, in reply to Mr. Godin, assured the House of Commons that the consent of the people of Manitoba to the measure would not be asked. This is irreconcilable with the treaty idea.

(9.) The delegates had no power, either from the people or from the Provisional Government to consent to the terms of the Act. Their ratification, if given, could have no more weight than a ratification by the Rajah of Jeypore, or a Chicago Alderman.

(10.) The Rev. Father Ritchot states that he only explained a few clauses to the Legislative Assembly on his return from Ottawa. That being the case, the Act was never properly before that body for acceptance.

(11.) Even if it had been, its acceptance by that body would bind no one. Even Mr. Ewart admits that the Provisional Government was illegal. On page 312 of his book he says :—" that the establishment of self-government, without the sanction of Her Majesty was undoubtedly illegal."

(12.) And finally, the despatch of a military force under a distinguished commander to force a "treaty" upon a community is somewhat unusual to say the least, and throws such an atmosphere of ludicrousness about Mr. Ewart's eighty pages of treaty theory, that further serious discussion would seem to be unnecessary.

But, it will be said, some of the utterances of the Judicial Committee would indicate that they were of the opinion that the Manitoba Act was a Parliamentary compact. This is no doubt the fact. But the matter was never seriously discussed before the Judicial Committee, and hardly any of the facts in this chapter referred to were brought to their notice. In order to interpret the statute it was not necessary to go behind it, and anything the Judicial Committee said in favor of the treaty idea,—I say it with all deference—was not considered and was therefore what lawyers call *OBITER DICTUM*, and of no effect.

Let us hope that the treaty theory has forever been disposed of. Let us recognize that in discussing the school question we are to be moved by no considerations appealing to the honor of

the Canadian people, which was never staked upon any assurance that the Roman Catholic church would be allowed forever, and forever special privileges to inculcate their dogmas in the public schools of Manitoba. Having done this, we will be in a suitable frame of mind to discuss the question in its true, rather than in its false aspects.

CHAPTER XIII.

NO. 3. THE LEGAL ARGUMENT. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC APPEAL WAS HEARD BY A COMMITTEE OF POLITICIANS AT OTTAWA WHO DID NOT SIT AS A JUDICIAL BODY. THE DECISION OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL DID NOT NECESSITATE THE PASSAGE OF THE REMEDIAL ORDER.

But, we are told, if the conscientious convictions of the Roman Catholic do not entitle him to the special privilege of teaching his own doctrines in the public schools, the decision of the Judicial Committee in the referred case of Brophy and others against the Attorney General of Manitoba, decided in 1894, most certainly requires that he should be given that privilege. This is the argument put forward on behalf of the Canadian Government. The manifest answer is that if the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council so decided, why was it necessary for a committee of the Dominion Government consisting of Sir Mackenzie Bowell, Sir Adolphe Caron, Hon. Mr. Foster, Hon. Mr. Patterson, Hon. Mr. Haggart, Hon. Mr. Ouimet, Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper, Hon. Mr. Ives, Hon. Mr. Daly, Hon. Mr. Angers, Hon. Mr. Dickey and Hon. Mr. Montague to sit in solemn conclave on February 6th and March 4th, 5th, 6th and 7th, listening to long and weighty arguments by Mr. McCarthy and Mr. Ewart on this very question.

What the Judicial Committee did or did not decide, however, need not remain as a matter of inference or argument merely. The various members of the committee expressed themselves so clearly and the judgment itself is so unambiguous that the attempt to place the responsibility for the remedial order upon the shoulders of the Privy Council can only be regarded with amazement. As before stated it was not necessary to the decision given by the Judicial Committee to determine what particular rights or privileges, if any, of the Roman Catholic minority were affected by the Acts of 1890, and they purposely refrained from doing so. When the Roman Catholic minority appealed to the Governor-General in Council for remedial legislation on the ground that their rights and privileges had been affected by the legislation of 1890 the Governor-General before entertaining the appeal sought the advice of the courts to ascertain, not what relief should be granted, but whether the appeal was one which could be heard under the terms of the constitution. It was decided that the appeal came

within the act ; as Mr. Christopher Robinson, Q. C., puts it " as I understand the judgment it cannot be said strictly speaking, to DECIDE more than that the appeal will lie."

The four important points in connection with the referred case are :—

1. It decided that an appeal would lie to the Governor-General-in-Council from the school legislation of 1890.
2. It did not decide what particular rights or privileges of the Roman Catholic minority had been affected by that legislation or what rights or privileges should be restored.
3. It was made clear that in hearing the appeal the Governor-General-in-Council would be acting in a political capacity only and not in any sense in a judicial capacity.
4. It was shown beyond all doubt that it was purely discretionary with the Governor General and the Parliament of Canada to remedy or not to remedy any grievances which might be found to have been caused by the school acts of 1890.

How the case was regarded both by the members of the Judicial Committee and the counsel representing the Roman Catholic minority is made abundantly evident by the following extracts from the report of the argument :—

The Lord Chancellor :—"All we have to see is what we think the jurisdiction of the Governor-General is." p. 38.

Lord Shand :—"All you can say is that, if it does affect a right or a privilege, then you ought to be allowed to appeal to the Governor-General so as to get redress by some subsequent legislation." p. 73.

Lord Watson :—"I am prepared to advise the Governor-General, and decide on the meaning of this clause, but I am not prepared to relieve him of the duty of considering how far he ought to interfere." p. 120.

Lord Watson :—"All we have got to say is whether it raises such a *prima facie* case that the Governor-General ought to proceed with the Appeal." p. 225.

Mr. Blake :—"The Lord Chancellor having made the following statement :—"The question seems to me to be this—If you are right in saying that the abolition of a system of denominational education which was created by post-union legislation is within the 2nd section of the Manitoba Act and the 3rd sub-section of the other, if it applies, then you say there is a case for the jurisdiction of the Governor-General and that is all we have to decide."

Mr. Blake replied :—"That is all your Lordships have to decide. What remedy he shall propose to apply is quite a different thing." p. 62.

Mr. Ewart in finishing his argument said :—"Before closing I would like to say a word or two as to what we are asking. As it has been already remarked, *we are not asking for any declaration as to the extent of the relief to be given by the Governor-General. We merely ask that it should be held that he has jurisdiction to hear our prayer, and to grant us some relief if he thinks proper to do so.*" p. 183.

In their judgment their Lordships say :—"Their Lordships have decided that the Governor-General-in-Council has jurisdiction and that the appeal is well founded, but the particular course to be pursued must be determined by the authorities to whom it has been committed by the statute." p. 286.

In brief, the Judicial Committee, merely decided that the appeal proposed was one which the Governor-General-in-Council could hear under the terms of the Manitoba Act, without for a moment attempting to say what particular rights or privileges had been affected, and without dictating what should be done by that tribunal.

THE DOMINION GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE NOT A JUDICIAL BODY.

In sitting to hear the appeal the committee of the Dominion Government had not the shadow of a right to pretend that they were sitting as a judicial body. In adopting the forms and procedure of a Court of Justice and calling their deliverances "judgments" a clumsy attempt was made to deceive the Canadian people. Fortunately the pretense was so transparent that but little deception was accomplished. The following extracts will show the views of the members of the Judicial Committee and the Roman Catholic counsel on this important question :—

Lord MacNaghten :—"We are a judicial body, and he is not sitting as a judicial body." p. 258.

Lord Shand :—"If the Appeal is before the Governor would he be entitled to take political considerations into view."

Mr. Blake :—"Doubtless."

Lord Shand :—"That is what you get into if your Appeal is a successful Appeal."

Mr. Blake :—"In my conception after His Excellency in Council has got rid of this preliminary question and by the light that the Courts of Justice throw upon the construction of the Statutes has found that there is a case for entertaining an appeal he proceeds to deal with that *ex necessitate rei* in a political sense, because what is to be done?" p. 37-38.

Mr. Blake :—"I do not ask your Lordship to make any suggestion as to his (the Governor-General's) action, which I conceived from the beginning is political. He is to be instructed as to the law; and then his action and the action of the Parliament will carry the thing out." p. 66.

Mr. Blake :—"The question whether upon the whole acting in their political capacity, the Privy Council believes that they ought not to act, or to act in what we may consider a lame and half hearted way, or to go the whole length of our demand, is no part of the question I have to submit to your Lordships." p. 38.

Mr. Blake :—"The appeal is to a political and non-judicial tribunal." p. 88.

The foregoing utterances of Lord Shand and Lord Macnaughton and the repeated admissions of Mr. Blake effectually dispose of the shallow pretense put forward by the committee of the Dominion Government that in hearing the appeal of the minority they were acting in a judicial capacity.

THE DECISION OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL DID NOT NECESSITATE THE PASSAGE OF A REMEDIAL ORDER.

As this appeal would be heard by the Governor-General-in-

Council in a political and not in a judicial capacity, and would afterwards be considered by Parliament in the same manner, it of course follows that it would be purely discretionary with both bodies to afford relief or not as they might see fit. The following extracts show this with regard to the Governor-General-in-Council:—

The Lord Chancellor :—“That would not seem “requisite for the due execution” if he thought that there had been an infringement, but that it was so unsubstantial that in substance they had all the rights which were intended to be preserved to them.” p. 259.

Lord Watson :—“What is given to the Governor is a discretion to do what he thinks fit on appeal.” p. 192.

Lord Watson :—“The Governor might be of opinion to-day or this year that it was not desirable in the interests of the community that certain previous privileges given by Parliament should be repealed; but ten years hence he might be of a different opinion.” p. 182.

Lord Watson :—“I suppose we are bound to give him advice in this Appeal. He has asked nothing else but advice throughout. He has not asked for a political decision which shall fetter him in any way.

Mr. Blake :—“It could not be. The law which creates the Tribunal for the purpose of giving advice expressly states that in their political capacity they are not bound by that advice.” p. 39.

The following extracts will show the discretionary powers possessed by Parliament in the same matter :—

Lord Macnaghten :—“And the Dominion Parliament cannot interfere, I suppose unless it is asked to do so and they are not bound even then.” p. 213.

Lord Watson :—“I apprehend that the Appeal to the Governor is an Appeal to the Governor’s discretion. It is a political administrative Appeal and not a judicial Appeal in any proper sense of the term, and in the same way after he has decided the same latitude of discretion is given to the Dominion Parliament. They may legislate or not as they think fit.” p. 193.

Lord Watson :—“The power given of Appeal to the Government, and upon request by the Governor to the Legislature of Canada, seems to be wholly discretionary in both.

Mr. Ewart :—No doubt.

Lord Watson :—Both in the Governor and in the Legislature.

Mr. Ewart :—Yes.” p. 180.

Nothing could be clearer than that the Dominion Government is in no way fettered by the decision of the Privy Council in the late appeal. Both of the Roman Catholic counsel, the Hon. Edward Blake, Q. C., and Mr. Ewart, Q. C., frankly admitted on the argument that the object of the appeal to the Privy Council was to ascertain if the proposed appeal by the minority to the Governor-in-Council was one which that tribunal had jurisdiction to hear. Mr. Blake expressly conceded that the appeal, if heard at all, would be heard by “a political and non-judicial body,” and added that no decision which the Privy Council might give could possibly bind the Government at Ottawa. Mr. Ewart also admitted in answer to Lord Watson that “the power given of

appeal to the government, and upon request by the Governor to the Legislature of Canada, was "wholly discretionary in both." The foregoing facts should forever explode the contention that the decision of the Privy Council in any way compelled the passage of the remedial order that was passed or a remedial order of any kind.

CHAPTER XIV.

NO. 4—THE GOSPEL OF DESPAIR AS PREACHED BY DR. GRANT, CONFEDERATION PRECEDENTS DO NOT APPLY AND HISTORY IS ALL THE OTHER WAY.

Many of the conclusions reached in the preceding chapters are quite in accord with the views of Dr. Grant. As to the inefficiency of the schools, he said in his first letter to *The Globe*:—"I have very little doubt that many of the Roman Catholic schools in Manitoba, prior to 1890, were about as poor as they could be, looked at from an intellectual or citizens point of view." As to the resulting illiteracy the same letter contained the following:—"The proofs of that are writ large in the present comparatively uneducated condition of the people, as well as their inability to speak English. The opposition to the proposal that trustees of schools and municipal councillors should be able to read and write was significant." He has also realized, to some extent at least, the practical difficulties which must beset any dual system of education in a Province where settlement is sparse and the burdens to be carried by the taxpayer are correspondingly great.

Nor does he seem to attach the slightest importance to any of the three arguments in favor of the restoration of separate schools dealt with in the last few chapters. In his concluding letter to *The Globe* he says with regard to the alleged treaty right to separate schools:—"The argument that the Province made "a treaty" with the Dominion, and that the Province for all time is bound by that Bill of Rights No. 4 the parentage of which is so obscure that few now venture to defend its legitimacy, simply suggests to men of common sense that the cause must be poor which has to be defended by such an argument." As to the claim that the decision of the Privy Council, necessitated the passage of the remedial order, he expressed himself as follows in an interview reported in a Winnipeg paper at the outset of his investigations:—"In closing, Principal Grant asked the reporter what was the chief argument upon which the supporters of the old system relied. The reporter explained that the main argument was that the decision of the Privy Council was a mandate and must be obeyed.

Principal Grant laughed at this, and said they must be badly off for an argument if they used this."

Nevertheless Dr. Grant strongly favors a compromise which will meet the views of the Roman Catholic hierarchy and will obliterate from our national school system their chief feature, the non-sectarian nature of the religious exercises.

THE GOSPEL OF DESPAIR.

"Of course" he says "we are told by those who, though in favor of religious exercises, are opposed to any special arrangements for Roman Catholics, that the Bible is not a Protestant book, and the Lord's prayer is not Protestant. It is, therefore, argued that Roman Catholics are unreasonable not to unite with us on this broad common religious platform. But they do object to such a union, and they think themselves reasonable. Why should they continue to shut their eyes to the plainest facts of history, our own history included? Western Christianity has been, and is, divided into the two great Confessions, and they stand over against each other to this day. That is the outstanding fact of the last three centuries.

"Canadians tried hard to ignore it for many a long year prior to 1863. The alluring vision of "a homogeneous and united people" danced before their eyes, but they forgot that a people can be truly united only when great minorities do not feel themselves treated with injustice. Strong willed statesmen like Geo. Brown, Alex. Mackenzie, Oliver Mowat, William McDougall and others dreamed of a system of common schools under which Protestant and Roman Catholic children should sit side by side on the same benches. They fought strenuously to realize their dream, but a long experience convinced them that it was the mere "baseless fabric of a vision," which floated before their eyes, and that the path of wisdom would be to accommodate themselves to stubborn facts. The settlement of 1863 was the result of compromise to which we owe Confederation. Wisdom seems to me to demand that we should stand on that, instead of beginning again the task of Sisyphus. To some this may seem a confession of defeat or the counsel of despair. It is not. Only through a loyal recognition of facts will present harmony and the ultimate unity of our people be secured."

It seems to me, on the contrary, that in taking such a position, Dr. Grant both confesses defeat and preaches despair. Let him call it "loyal recognition of facts," or adopt any phrase that may

suggest itself, yet it must be clear that despair is the basis of the compromise idea. Dr. Grant, as I have pointed out, scouts the suggestion that the Roman Catholics are entitled to separate schools by treaty, and "laughed" when his interviewer referred to the contention that the remedial order is to be regarded as a mandate. What then are the facts to which we owe this "loyal recognition?" The main, and seemingly the only fact is that the Roman Catholic hierarchy must have what ever they want. Why does Dr. Grant parade before us the failure of "strong willed statesmen like Geo. Brown, Alex. Mackenzie, Oliver Mowat, William McDougall and others" who dreamed of a system of common schools under which Protestant and Roman Catholic children should sit side by side on the same benches," unless it be further to impress upon us his gospel of despair? Why did George Brown, Alexander Mackenzie and others who were forced to concede separate schools to the Roman Catholic church take such a course? Was it because they saw anything in the system meriting their approval? On the contrary their desire was that Protestants and Roman Catholics should be educated side by side, that there should be one great system of education for Canada and that of a national and unsectarian character. But the hierarchy stood in the way, and rather than yield the hope of a United Canada, these strong willed statesmen" complied with their demands. Unlike Dr. Grant, however, they confessed defeat and grounded their action on despair. They deeply regretted the necessity compelling them but did not seek to disguise the humiliating outcome of their struggle with the hierarchy by terming it a "loyal recognition of facts." Why cannot Dr. Grant take the same manly course?

DR. GRANT'S FALSE ANALOGIES.

Then, again, where is the analogy between Manitoba's case and the struggles of 1863-7? We are not forming Confederation now. We are not even seeking to add Manitoba as a Province. All that was finally completed in 1867 and 1870. We are simply dealing with a detail of administration. We say that we favor a national system of schools where all our children will have the advantage of being educated together, of learning to understand one another, of sympathizing with one another, and of entertaining national aspirations in common. We are forming a system which

is fair to all alike, and discriminates in favor of no sect or community, which does not hold the different races of our Dominion asunder, thereby begetting ignorance and arousing suspicion. We are forming—rather we have adopted—a system of education which squares with all modern ideas of what is intelligent, just, and beneficial to the community with which our interests are most closely bound up, and we do not propose to renounce our convictions, our principles, our desires, for the purpose of conceding special privileges to the Roman Catholic hierarchy, or any other ecclesiastical organization, even if it does add vote getting and other attributes of the earth earthy to its proper recognized functions. With Dr. Grant we scout the idea that the Roman Catholics have any constitutional right to separate schools. With him we may be permitted to “laugh” at the contention that the decision of the Privy Council is a mandate which required the passage of the remedial order. Having gone that far the people of Manitoba refuse to grant a special privilege to the Roman Catholic church. To them Anglicanism is as good as Roman Catholicism, and Presbyterianism and Methodism are as good as either. They do not see eye to eye with Dr. Grant. They refuse what Dr. Grant calls “loyal recognition of facts” unless to recognize those facts is consistent with their ideas of fair dealing and honorable conduct.

THE FACTS OF HISTORY.

“Why,” says Dr. Grant, “should we continue to shut our eyes to the plainest facts of history, our own history included? Western Christianity has been, and is, divided into the two great Confessions, and they stand over against each other to this day. That is the outstanding fact of the last three centuries.” Granted, but where does the argument lead? What aid does it give to the separate school idea? Does the history of the United States afford any comfort to the advocates of separate schools? What about Mexico, Central America and the South American republics? What about the Provinces of the Dominion of Canada? May it not be replied to Dr. Grant that one “outstanding fact” in the history of western christianity, is that the separate school is being pushed to the wall despite the gospel of despair, and that the verdict on all sides is in favor of the complete separation of church and state.

GROWING INDEPENDENCE OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMEN.

An all important fact in this connection is that many Roman Catholics are of this same opinion. To repeat the quotation from Mr. Gladstone :—"All other Christian bodies are content with freedom in their own religious domain : Orientals, Lutherans, Calvinists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Nonconformists, one and all in the present day, contentedly and thankfully accept the benefits of civil order ; never pretend that the state is not its own master ; make no religious claims to temporal possessions or advantages ; and consequently, never are in perilous collision with the state. Nay more, even so, I believe, it is with the mass of Roman Catholics individually." Manitoba will not cease to look for support from many Roman Catholics individually in the fight which has been undertaken. Many of them have, like O'Connell, long since perceived the folly of taking their politics from Rome, of being guided in their temporal and municipal affairs by the dictates of "a small assemblage of foreign gentlemen in Italy, perhaps not one of whom ever set foot in this country." All that a foreign hierarchy can do will not conceal from them the fact that a public school training is necessary to prepare their children for the struggles of every day life.

Hence it is that, to quote Prof. Charles J. Little, of the Northwestern University :—"In New York diocese, with its reported 800,000 Catholic population, there are only 38,383 children in the parochial schools. In that of Syracuse there only 4,401 to a reported Catholic population of 100,000. In the diocese of Boston there are 27,500 to a Catholic population of 510,000 ; in New Orleans, 8,093 to a Catholic population of 300,000 ; and even in that of Baltimore, but 16,000 in a Catholic population of 220,000, while the diocese of Albany has only 11,192 in a reported population of 200,000." Hence it is that in Ontario, despite the Separate Schools, two-thirds of the Roman Catholic children are to be found receiving their education in the Public Schools. That the Roman Catholic layman has resolved to remain no longer a slave to the hierarchy in educational matters has been clearly shown of late in various parts of Canada. As Dr. Grant himself says :—"Who insisted two years ago, on getting good teachers into the separate schools

of Kingston but the Roman Catholic laity, with the results that, at this year's entrance examination to the collegiate institute, the second, third and fourth places were taken by pupils from those schools? Who are now insisting in Ottawa on getting good teachers into the separate schools but the Roman Catholic laity? They will get their way, too, no matter what the Archbishop or the Christian Brothers may think of their attitude. Who are pressing for reforms in the Roman Catholic schools of Québec now but distinguished Roman Catholic laymen, school inspectors and others well acquainted with the actual state of affairs?"

FRENCH SCHOOLS WHICH HAVE ADOPTED THE PUBLIC SCHOOL SYSTEM.

If left alone by Dr. Grant and other advocates of a backboneless policy on the school question the people of Manitoba do not entertain the slightest fears as to the successful working of the School Act. That the success already attained has been very considerable will be shown by the following list, taken from the report of Mr. A. L. Young, inspector of French public school, of the French schools which have accepted the public school system:—

NAME OF DISTRICT.	POST OFFICE.
1. St. Jean Baptiste North.....	St. Jean Baptiste.
2. Deux Petites Pointes.....	Letellier
3. St. Charles.....	St. Charles.
4. St. Francois Xavier East.....	St. Francois Xavier.
5. St. Eustache.....	St. Eustache.
6. Fairbanks.....	Baie St. Paul.
7. St. Leon Village.....	St. Leon.
8. St. Leon East.....	Manitou.
9. Theobald.....	Somerset.
10. Decorby.....	Fort Ellice.
11. St. Alphonse South.....	Mariapolis.
12. St. Laurent No. 1.....	St. Laurent.
13. St. Laurent No. 2.....	St. Laurent.
14. St. Boniface West.....	St. Vital.
15. Kinlough.....	Starbuck.
16. Martineau.....	Water Hen River, Indian Reserve.
17. St. Raymond.....	Giroux
18. St. Vital East.....	St. Boniface
19. Glengarry.....	Ingleside—Scotch Catholics.
20. Fannystelle.....	Fannystelle.
21. Bernier.....	St. Marks.
22. Camper.....	Minnewakan—Mixed.
23. St. Antoine.....	Ste. Agathe.
24. St. Hyacinthe.....	La Salle—Mixed.

25. Arsenault.....Oak Lake—Mixed
 26. Deleau.....Deleau “
 27. Maffam.....Deleau “
 28. Routledge.....Routledge. “
 29. St. Urbain.....St. Alphonse (school not yet built).
 30. Canadaville.....Dauphin Road (school not yet built).
 31. Hamelin.....Ste. Rose du Lac.
 32. St. Felix.....Deloraine.
 33. St. Francois Xavier West.....S. Francois Xavier.
 34. Huns Valley.....Huns Valley (school building).
 35. Gascon.....Clarkleigh.
 36. Courchene.....Oak Lake (organization not complete).
 37. Pike Lake.....St. Alphonse.

A REMARKABLE SHOWING.

The following statement shows the year when each school adopted the public school system :—

Name of District.	Date receiving grant as Public schools :							
	1891.		1892.		1893.		1894.	
	1st.	2nd.	1st.	2nd.	1st.	2nd.	1st.	2nd.
St. Jean Baptiste North.....							I	I
Deux Petites Pointes..							I	I
St. Charles								I
St. Francois Xavier East.....								I
St. Eustache.....								I
Fairbanks						I	I	I
St. Leon Village.....	I	I			I	I	I	I
St. Leon East.....						I	I	I
Theobald.....						I	I	I
Decorby.....							I	I
St. Alphonse South.....								I
St. Laurent No. 1.....							I	I
St. Laurent No. 2.....							I	I
St. Boniface West.....				I	I	I	I	I
Martineau.....	I	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
St. Raymond.....		I	I	I	I	I	I	I
St. Vital East.....					I	I	I	I
Glengarry.....				I	I	I	I	I
Bernier.....		I	I	I	I	I	I	I
Camper.....	I		I	I	I	I	I	I
St. Antoine.....		I		I	I	I	I	I
St. Hyacinthe.....								I
Arsenault.....								I
Deleau.....								I
Maffam.....					I	I	I	I
Routledge.....								
St. Urbane.....								
Canadaville.....								
Hamelin.....								
St. Felix.....								
Kinlough.....							I	I
Huns Valley.....								
formed since 1890.								
	3	5	4	7	10	13	20	26

Three at the beginning of 1891, ten at the beginning of 1893, twenty at the beginning of 1894, twenty six at the end of that year, and now thirty seven ! Surely these facts are more to the point than all the pessimistic comments and lugubrious forecasts of Dr. Grant, whose observations occupied but a few days, and whose conclusions are in so many instances based upon a complete lack of knowledge of the question under discussion.

ALL WILL COME IN EVENTUALLY.

Dr. Grant has quoted Mr. Young's report at times ; why has he not referred to his conclusion on the whole question ? It is as follows :—

“ The constant agitation which has been kept up during the past five years has certainly had the effect of creating an increased interest in regard to educational matters ; and I am satisfied that when the school question is finally settled this increased interest will have a very beneficial effect on the French schools of the Province of Manitoba. From my intercourse with the French and Half-breed Catholics of the Province, I have no hesitation in saying that the vast majority of them are prepared to abide by the final decision of the authorities in regard to the school question. They still cling to the hope that the separate school system will be restored to the Province, but should this hope not be realized in the near future, it will only be a matter of a short time before the public school system will practically be universally adopted throughout the Province.”

If the Ottawa Government will not interfere with our national school system, there need be little fear as to the French Roman Catholics—they will in time adopt it.

CHAPTER XV.

THE GRANT LETTERS—A SERIES OF MISSTATEMENTS—HOW DR. GRANT COPIED SOCRATES.

Before concluding it is perhaps advisable to answer some of the statements made and opinions advanced by Dr. Grant. In ending his interesting series of letters he leaves his readers at liberty to accept or reject his opinions, and adds "but the facts which have been stated must stand." Doubtless "facts" must always stand; the objection is that Dr. Grant has not stated "facts." Some of these alleged facts have already been dealt with. It has been shown that two of the most serious complaints put forward are not founded on fact. There is no justification for the statement, to which so much importance was attached, that Roman Catholic property had been confiscated by the acts of 1890. Dr. Grant was both indignant and pathetic over this monstrous injustice. Fortunately it never existed outside of his own mind and the imaginations of those who misinformed him. Another serious grievance was that Protestant exercises are made use of in the public schools under the guise of unsectarian instruction. This charge was also unwarranted. The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council expressly determined that the exercises are thoroughly unsectarian. A third statement was that the men responsible for the change made in the Acts of 1890 did not attack the old system for faulty administration or poor results, but they took the ground that it was wrong in principle and must be abolished root and branch. This, too, has been shown to be absolutely untrue. It will be found on examination that many other of his statements are equally unreliable.

To enlist sympathy for the Roman Catholic minority, whose cause he has espoused, he has sought to point out other ways in which they were unjustly treated by the Manitoba Government. The following is one of the alleged acts of injustice:—

"I do not profess to understand the exact force of the Archbishop's objection, neither do I understand why the Government of Manitoba declined to entertain the overtures, based upon the three concessions which I have shown are already made in the

case of the French rural schools, which have adopted the new system. After the first judgment of the Privy Council was announced, the trustees of the Roman Catholic Winnipeg schools appointed Messrs. Prendergast and Bawlf to interview the public school board, with a view of coming to a reasonable compromise. The board received them in a friendly spirit, and referred them to the Government, as it alone could sanction any concessions. The two delegates asked that their schools should be allowed to go on as they were for a year, as a test; that time might thus be given for their teachers to become certificated, and get a gradual change of text-books, and also that a special hour should be set apart for religious instruction. Now, as has been pointed out, these concessions are allowed in rural districts, where generally Protestant and Roman Catholic children have to attend the same school. Much more, surely, should they be allowed in Winnipeg, where there is room for both classes of schools, and no such necessity is incumbent on the children. Had the Government shown any disposition to listen to these overtures, even as a basis for negotiations, it was proposed to summon a meeting of the Roman Catholic ratepayers of the city and obtain their consent. But they declare that the door was shut in their faces. They were told that the advisory board prescribed the text-books, and that the government had only to administer the law, and had not the power to make any change.

* * * * *

One feels his sympathy for them quickened immeasurably when he learns that overtures for a compromise came from them, a compromise which the spirit of even-handed justice should have induced the government to have accepted, and that instead of the overtures being entertained, the deputation were curtly told that they were suffering no grievance, and that their duty was to comply with the law."

Unfortunately for Dr. Grant his sympathies have been "quickened immeasurably" by a mass of misrepresentation to which in all innocence he has given a wide circulation. The position taken by the Winnipeg Public School Board at its meeting held on the 3rd day of August, 1894, was very clearly defined. There was no disposition whatever to accede to the demands made by the Roman Catholic delegation. On the con-

trary the members of the Board felt that an attempt was being made to insert the thin edge of the wedge with a view to a gradual restoration of the old sectarian system, and were determined in their opposition to the proposal on that account. The charges made by Dr. Grant against the Government are not only misleading but directly contrary to facts. The proposition made to the Government was not a proposition for a compromise. When the members of the deputation laid it before the Government they were asked if it was a proposition for a compromise of the dispute over the school question and they distinctly affirmed that it was not. They further said that they were not in any position to make any promise as to what would be done in the future and the substance of their remarks was that it could be accepted that the contest over the school question would be continued with unabated vigor, but that in the meantime they, representing the Catholics of the city of Winnipeg, desired that the proposition should be accepted and assistance given to their schools. The acceptance of such a proposition would have been in the last degree absurd. It was in no sense a compromise. It was a proposition that the Government should sustain and assist those who were fighting the national school system and give them aid and comfort to enable them to carry on the contest; they, at the same time informing the Government that they had no confidence in their system nor in them, and that they did not propose to compromise with them in any way. Even Dr. Grant must admit that the course adopted by the Government was the only one possible under the circumstances. He will further experience some surprise that he has been so misled by those with whom he has conversed and who apparently have given the proposition, possibly unintentionally, an entirely different color and meaning from that which could properly be attached to it.

Dr. Grant has endeavored at great length to show that in the Mennonite and French schools which have come under the public school system sectarian religious instruction proceeds very much in the same way as when they were purely-denominational schools. His object is very apparent. While commending the Government from time to time for the leniency and consideration thus displayed in seeking to win over the French and Mennonites by degrees, it is clear that friendliness to the position

taken by Manitoba is not the guiding motive. Dr. Grant came to Manitoba with his mind made up. He came here as the enemy of the national school system. His hostility was evidenced in his first letter written a few days after his arrival, and therefore before his investigations—which were ridiculously brief in any event—had been more than entered upon. His aim in seeking to show that denominationalism still characterizes the religious exercises of the French and Mennonite public schools is evidently to destroy sympathy for the cause of the Province. He knows that the strength of the Government lies to a great extent in the universal belief that they are resolutely contending for a valued principle and that to arouse suspicion of their sincerity in the public mind must inevitably inflict upon them and upon the advocacy of national schools irreparable injury.

It is generally known that under the public school system every teacher is required to make an affidavit setting forth either that the trustees of the school have not directed that any religious exercises are to be used and that accordingly none have been used, or that they have directed that the religious exercises prescribed by the advisory board be used, and that those exercises and none other, have accordingly been made use of. The form of affidavit is printed on every half-yearly report and is as follows :

MANITOBA :	}	I,.....
Municipality of.....		Teacher of the School District of.....Number
To Wit :		in the Municipality of..... in the Province of Manitoba, do solemnly declare.

[a] Use which-
ever clause is ac-
cording to facts
and strike out the
other.

1. (a) That the Trustees of the said School have directed that the Religious Exercises prescribed by the Advisory Board be used in said School, and that the said Religious Exercises, and none other, have accordingly been used in said School.

1. (a) That the Trustees of said School have not directed that any Religious Exercises be used in said School, and accordingly none have been used therein.

2. That the record for the attendance of pupils, and the other information herein furnished, is correct and true to the best of my knowledge and belief, and I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of "The Canada Evidence Act, 1893,"

[b] This declaration may be received by any Judge, Notary Public, Justice of the Peace, Police or Stipendary Magistrate, Recorder, Mayor or Commissioner in B. R., who must show after his signature his official designation.

Declared before me at.... }
 in the.... of..... }
 this..... day of..... } Teacher
 A. D. 189.. }

.....
 (b) A Justice of the Peace.

No school is entitled to receive the government grant unless this affidavit is duly sworn out and returned to the department of education. The officials of the education department state that the law in this respect is rigidly adhered to and that no grant is given where the necessary affidavit is withheld. It is difficult to see what further could be done to ensure that the law in this respect is fully obeyed.

According to Dr. Grant, however, "the religious exercises are practically the same as under the old denominational system." The following is his account of what takes place in the French schools which have come under the public school system:—
 "This is managed by means of the rule quoted in a former letter, which allows the trustees to fix an hour earlier than 4 p. m. for closing, and by a rule which permits schools to be used for other purposes than teaching outside the regular hours. This school opens at 9, the regular hour, but teachers and scholars assemble a little sooner and it is opened with prayer. Even if the hour should be 9, the teacher can "make it" 8:45 as easily as a captain of a ship can make it eight bells, or as the House of Commons can make 5:30 into 6 o'clock when it is desirable to do so. The school closes at 12, and immediately thereafter the teacher kneels, and he and the pupils join in the Lord's prayer. He then invokes St. Joseph three times, the pupils at each invocation crying reverently "priez pour nous" (pray for us), after which they disperse to their homes. The closing in the afternoon is fixed by the trustees at 3:30, and at that hour catechism and sacred history are taken up, and the children having per-

haps learned the lessons at home, are drilled in those branches of sacred learning." The Mennonites, he says, accomplish the same thing in another way, as follows :—"The religious difficulty, it seems to me, is also evaded, partly under the law and partly outside of its spirit. The law says that religious exercises must be conducted according to the regulations of the Advisory Board, and that the time for them shall be just before the closing hour in the afternoon. Everywhere else this law is interpreted as meaning that the teachers are restricted to the exercises provided, and that only from five to ten minutes should be occupied with them. But that is not the Mennonite interpretation. The Department of Education has adopted a regulation which, in declaring the length of the school day to be six hours, goes on to say, "unless the trustees by resolution prescribe a shorter period." Under this general resolution the Mennonites get in as much time as they like for religious exercises, without lengthening the school day. They get in religious instruction at other times, too, rather ingeniously. No text-books can be used except those which have been authorized. But, it is argued, that regulation applies only to the branches enjoined to be taught, and the Department has authorized no text-books for instruction in German. Until it does so, there is no violation of the law in using the excellent German translation of the Bible as a text-book for teaching the language, and in so doing "note and comment" cannot possibly be avoided. In a word, the Mennonite Public Schools are to all intents and purposes denominational."

It is difficult to treat some of the above statements seriously. No doubt "even if the hour should be 9 the teacher can "make it" 8:45 as easily as a captain of a ship can make it eight bells; or as the House of Commons can make 5:30 into 6 o'clock when it is desirable to do so." But what about the affidavit? The flippant way in which the insinuation is made, reflecting as it does most seriously upon the honor of the teachers in the Roman Catholic public schools would indicate that Dr. Grant has not considered the gravity of the offence with which he has charged them. The whole thing sounds suspiciously like some old woman's tale picked up by Dr. Grant during his lightning investigation of the school question. The same remarks will apply to the statement that the Mennonite teachers reconcile their consciences to the prescribed oath by using their Bible as a reader

*Including three new districts.

The highest point touched was in 1894 and 1895 and not in 1886. The fact that Principal Grant placed the highest point in 1887, a year before the Greenway Government came into power, would indicate that his informant in this instance sought to score a point against that administration. But if, as is generally understood, Dr. Grant only drove through one Mennonite reserve and did not visit the other at all, it cannot be expected that his observations are entitled to much reliance. The same may be said of his remarks on the French public schools. In one of his recent letters he seemed to realize this. "It is impossible, too," he said "for a private person like myself to make a thorough investigation, even had he the time at his disposal. It would need three months instead of the three weeks, which is all that I can spare." And yet in his very first letter, before he had been anything like three weeks in the Province, we found him declaring that "unfortunately neither the Provincial nor the Federal Government was possessed of the wisdom required at the different times." The whole people of Manitoba who have repeatedly endorsed the action of the present Government after years of study of every phase of the school question were not "possessed of the wisdom required at the different times," and it only arrived with the advent of Dr. Grant.

It is difficult to arrive at the precise theory of the Grant letters. The dissertations on the peculiarities of the Trappist monks, the social, political and religious life of the Mennonites, the off-hand easy-going disposition of the French half-breed, and so on, are interesting even if they are not true to life. His estimate of the Icelanders is not so interesting, and is in some important respects, entirely untrue. But the question after all is, what does he advise? He sees this himself and answers as follows:—"Coming now to the main question of this communication, it is quite evident that it would be an impertinence for an outsider to state in detail the changes that should be made in the law or in the administration of the law, in order to remove the grievances that exist; but it may not be out of place to indicate a method by which the people of Manitoba might arrive at just conclusions on the subject." The reader will like to know where the impertinence exists. If it was not impertinent on Dr. Grant's part to charge the country with lack of wisdom on the whole question, it

would hardly be an impertinence for him to suggest a remedy. The proper remedy, then, seems to be as follows:—"If, for instance, the government asked four or five of the best school inspectors, including those for the Mennonites, for the French, and for Winnipeg city, to meet half a dozen other wise men, including the President of the Advisory Board, Father Cherrier, Principal King, and a representative of the Winnipeg R. C. schools, such a conference might be trusted to draw up resolutions which, at any rate, would be helpful and which might be accepted by reasonable men off all parties, and so put an end to the present agitation on which the demagogues alone thrive. This is indeed an edifying proposition. The President of the Advisory Board was the practical plaintiff in the case of Logan vs. The City of Winnipeg in which the restoration of separate schools was sought. Father Cherrier is, next to Archbishop Langevin, the most influential opponent of the Government on the school question. Then it is further proposed to add "a representative of the Winnipeg R. C. schools." It is proposed that they with Principal King and one or two others should confer with four or five of the best school inspectors and pass resolutions which would settle the school question. In other words the Government is asked to abrogate its functions and take its policy on the school question from a committee nominated in the first instance by Dr. Grant. The proposition is so opposed to all constitutional precedent and so ridiculous from every point of view that one is tempted to rank it with what Dr. Grant calls the "comical side" of his discourse which includes the story of "Hall Caine's Gubblum, Tom's rusty throat, and John's big toe, and lang Geordie's broken nose."

In conclusion Dr. Grant informs us that in the course of his investigation he took care to put himself "as much as possible in the attitude of Socrates, who professed to know nothing but to be simply an enquirer. I must have succeeded at least to a certain extent in maintaining this attitude, to judge by the remark of a gentleman who, in speaking to a friend of the conversation he had with me, said: "Is it not astonishing how little Principal Grant knows of the subject?." Indeed, it is astonishing, but as Socrates said himself after his search for the wise man "O Athenians, the impression made on me was this: The persons of most repute seemed to me nearly the most deficient of all."

CHAPTER XVI.

CONCLUSION — THE REMEDIAL ORDER FOLLY — WHAT IT MEANS—THE “GRIEVANCE” IS TECHNICAL— DUTY OF THE OTTAWA GOVERNMENT.

In their reply to the remedial order the Manitoba Government urged upon the Dominion Government the advisability of appointing a commission to fully inquire into all the facts bearing upon the school question before any further action should be taken. The words of the reply in this connection were :—“ We believe that when the remedial order was made, there was not then available to Your Excellency in council full and accurate information as to the working of our former system of schools. We also believe that there was lacking the means of forming a correct judgment as to the effect upon the province of the changes indicated in the order.

“Being impressed with this view, we respectfully submit that it is not yet too late to make a full and deliberate investigation of the whole subject. Should such a course be adopted we shall cheerfully assist in offering the most complete information available. An investigation of such a kind would furnish a substantial basis of fact upon which conclusions could be formed with a reasonable degree of certainty.

“ It is urged most strongly that upon so important a matter, involving as it does, the religious feelings and convictions of different classes of the people of Canada and the educational interests of a province which is expected to become one of the most important in the Dominion, no hasty action should be taken, but that on the contrary the greatest care and deliberation should be exercised and a full and thorough investigation made.”

A more reasonable proposition could not be made. As has been pointed out by Mr. Laurier the question at issue is largely a question of fact, and the facts cannot be arrived at without a full investigation by a properly appointed commission. The *Globe* long ago took this position, and its lead has been followed by many of the best journals in Canada. Dr. Grant takes a similar view, and it is impossible to conceive how it can be dissented from by anyone who is willing to regard so great a question reasonably and dispassionately.

THE REMEDIAL ORDER FOLLY.

The folly of the course which has been actually pursued must be most obvious. The remedial order commands the immediate restoration to the Roman Catholics of:—

(a.) "The right to build, maintain, equip, manage, conduct, and support Roman Catholic schools in the manner provided for by the said statutes which were repealed by the two Acts of 1890 aforesaid.

(b.) The right to share proportionately in any grant made out of the public funds for the purposes of education.

(c.) The right of exemption of such Roman Catholics as contribute to Roman Catholic schools from all payment or contribution to the support of any other schools."

Nothing could be wider. It is a summary order to Manitobans to restore the old system of education with all its wretched features. There is no reservation of any kind whatever. If it is carried, there will be nothing to prevent the Archbishop from filling the schools with teachers chosen without examination from the ranks of the priests and sisters; nothing to prevent the installation again of priests as inspectors of the schools; no bar to the reintroduction of crucifixes and flamboyant pictures of the Pope keeping the door of Heaven and Luther taking the path to hell; no curb to check them from teaching their children, our future Roman Catholic citizens, that their Protestant fellow citizens are doomed to damnation; no improvement on the miserable travesty upon education which was carried on under the Roman Catholic section; no guarantee that the state will be relieved from a dead load of illiteracy with its concomitant amount of crime; no stop to the system of establishing schools in populous districts to obtain the largest possible legislative grants, and of neglecting entirely the districts where population is sparse and the grant limited; no hindrance to the scheme of employing the public money to support a large number of priests and sisters of charity as teachers and inspectors, and of placing both the power to tax and the distribution of public moneys under the control of the Archbishop; nothing to save this great and progressive Province destined to become one of the most important of the Dominion, from the blighting effects of all the bad features of the old separate school

system. And we have been imperatively commanded to put on these cast off garments in the interests of a class who have no moral nor constitutional right to what they claim, by a Government which, under the decision of the Privy Council, possessed full discretion to refuse the passage of a remedial order of any kind.

NEED OF A COMMISSION.

Before the final step is taken, and this crime against Provincial autonomy has gone its full length, Manitoba has asked that an investigation be made, and has promised her cordial assistance in furnishing all the information desired. The answer of the Dominion Government press is that no investigation will be held, but that at a session of parliament to take place next January measures will be passed to compel this fair province to submit again to an educational system which would disgrace any intelligent people. It is because this commission seems likely to be refused that an effort has been made in these pages to discover a few of the bad features of the old system which this Province is called upon to restore. Much more evidence of equal importance could be furnished if a commission were appointed. There are those who will continue to assert that nothing is gained by exposing all the defects of the old system, because, like anything else, it is open to improvement. To all such weak nonsense the remedial order is a complete answer. It directs the restoration of the old state of things with no guarantee of improvement. We can assume nothing more than that if such a thing is done, wretched teaching, resulting illiteracy, and all the other bad features of the old separate schools will flourish as before. It is most important too, that the evils of the old system should be comprehended because like the statistics of all foreign countries they show that any compromise by which the priests are enabled to control the education of Roman Catholics cannot but, as in Ottawa recently, lead to bad results.

It is not too late, however, for the Government at Ottawa to retrace its steps by recalling the remedial order and providing for an investigation of facts by a competent commission. The most that could be said against such a course is that it would cause some delay. But what is the disadvantage of a slight delay, or any delay, as against the evils which must flow from a hasty settlement of one of the most important questions which

ever presented itself to Canadian statesmen for solution? No intelligent Canadian could honestly object to a postponement of the matter pending investigation. The good sense of the Dominion would support such a course with general acclaim. Unless the Dominion Government has determined to coerce Manitoba at the dictation of Quebec, for the sole purpose of controlling the Roman Catholic vote, it must retrace its steps and appoint a commission. The ministers at Ottawa will find that they are living in a 'fools' castle if they imagine that a remedial order based upon ignorance of the very facts with which it deals can ever be made effectual by any known method of legislation. The Roman Catholic people are indulging in a vain hope if they imagine that permanent benefit will come to them from abusing the power which they possess by forcing the Dominion ministers to deal precipitately with Manitoba on this question.

THE "GRIEVANCE" IS TECHNICAL.

But, we are told, it has been held that the Roman Catholics have a "grievance," and a grievance must be promptly remedied. The sentiment is admirable, but let it be remembered that there are such things as technical grievances as well as those which are moral. The Roman Catholics have no moral right to separate schools, and therefore no moral grievance. They have no constitutional or legal right, and therefore no constitutional or legal grievance. Whatever grievance they experience is technical in its nature. An illustration will make this clear, and will show the difference between a technical and a moral grievance. If it had been provided by the school acts of 1871 that a Roman Catholic should in no case pay more than half the school tax to be paid by a Protestant under the same circumstances, a repeal of such a provision by the acts of 1890 would have furnished the Roman Catholic minority with a "grievance." It would be a technical grievance, however. It would not be a moral grievance, but, if anything, immoral. This word "grievance" in connection with the school question is clearly a misnomer. It implies the idea that a wrong has been done while all that we really know is that a changed condition has taken place. If the acts of 1890 had been passed in 1871, establishing a national system of schools, there would have been nothing of which the Roman Catholic minority could complain. This was admitted

by Mr. Blake, counsel for the Roman Catholics before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the last appeal. The following passage is taken from page 107 of the argument :—

Lord MacNaghten—"If an act, similar to the act of 1890, had been passed in 1871, you would have had no privileges at all."

Mr. Blake—"Granted, my lord."

Clearly then, there is no moral or natural grievance to remedy. The whole contention comes to this, that because Manitoba was good enough to grant special privileges to the Roman Catholics she is not to be allowed to take them away. The Province was under no obligation to grant privileges of any kind, but it would nevertheless be a monstrously immoral thing for her to put an end to an arrangement which she made of her own accord and on her own responsibility !

CONCLUSION.

The position in which the members of the Ottawa Government are placed is simple enough. As has been so often pointed out, they are free agents, untrammelled by the decision of the Judicial Committee. They are sitting not as judges, but as politicians—or as statesmen if that word is preferable—and can pass or refuse to pass a remedial order just as they see fit. On the one side the Roman Catholics say that they are entitled to separate schools because by passing an act in 1871 Manitoba fell into a trap which had been laid for her by the Manitoba Act, and can never change the system then created, without causing a "grievance" to the Roman Catholic minority. On the other hand nearly the whole people of the Province without distinction of creed, or politics assert that a greater and more real grievance would be thrust upon them by restoring the separate school system. From one side Mr. Ewart points out that "almost every step in the constitutional history of Canada has been accompanied by assurances given to Roman Catholics," and instances the capitulations of Quebec and Montreal (1759 and 1760) The Treaty of Paris, (1763), The Quebec Act, (1774), The Constitutional Act, (1791), The Union Act, (1840), The Confederation Act, (1867) and the Manitoba Act. By the other side this is admitted, and it is charged that the hierarchy took advantage of every distressing crisis in our history to exact further concessions for

their church as the price of Quebec's assistance. They assert that too many concessions to Quebec have nearly ended in creating a foreign nation on the banks of the St. Lawrence, and that it is time to call a halt, and remember that there are other people possessing rights in Canada besides the priests and those in their charge. The question is one which calls for a great deal of serious consideration and a full investigation of many and various facts of great importance. It must be raised above the level of political demands and party pressure and considered with all the care that is possible to sober and enlightened statesmanship. If this is done, the remedial order will never be enforced, and whether an investigation is directed or not, anyone having the slightest confidence in Canadian institutions must feel convinced that Manitoba will never be compelled to tear down her national school system to replace it with the discarded and discredited arrangement which was obliterated by the Acts of 1890.

APPENDIX A.

(See Page 10.)

PROGRAMME OF STUDIES FOR CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.

FIRST DIVISION.

1. Religious Instruction : Prayers and the first two lessons of Butlers Catechism.
2. Useful Knowledge : Questions on senses and time.
3. Becomingness : Cleanliness, good countenance, due regard to parents and masters.
4. Vocal Music : Easy Songs.
5. Spelling : On the chart, book and by heart.
6. Reading : On Chart and in Primer.
7. Writing : Letters and figures on slates.
8. Calculation : Oral and written numeration. Arabic notation 1 to 1000, Mental addition and subtraction 1 to 20.

SECOND DIVISION.

1. Religious Instruction ; Catechism, Apostles Creed.
2. Useful Knowledge : Questions on Buildings, Furniture, Garments and Colours.
3. Becomingness : Reverence in the House of God, Good demeanor, Benevolence and Politeness towards companions and strangers, Good nature towards animals.
4. Vocal Music : Songs and Hymns.
5. Spelling and Defining : Words of the First Book.
6. Reading : First Book.
7. Writing : Sentences on slates and boards.
8. Calculation : Roman figures I to C., numeration complete Table of Multiplication to 6, easy mental exercises on the first four rules.
9. History : History of Old Testament to the vocation of Abraham.

THIRD DIVISION.

1. Religious Instruction : Catechism—The Sacraments.
2. Useful Knowledge : Questions on cardinal points of compass, currency and measure in use.
3. Becomingness : Respect to the old age and to the dignitaries. How to designate persons and things. How to behave in society and on the streets.
4. Vocal Music : Church Chants.

5. Spelling and Defining : Words of the Second Book.
6. Reading : Second Book.
7. Writing : On paper and on Copy Book, No's. 1 and 2.
8. Calculation : Table of Multiplication, Decimal fractions.
The four simple rules with mental exercises.
9. History : Old Testament from the vocation of Abraham.
10. Grammar : From the beginning to verbs, with corresponding exercises.
11. Composition : Letters to parents.
12. Geography : Geographical definitions.

FOURTH DIVISION.

1. Religious Instruction . Catechism from the Commandments to the end of the catechism.
2. Useful Knowledge : Questions on water, cloud dew, rain, hail, and snow.
3. Becomingness: Habits of order, politeness at table and manner of saluting.
4. Vocal Music : Plain Chant,
5. Spelling and Defining : Words of the Third Book.
6. Reading : Third Book and Latin.
7. Writing : On paper and Copy Books No's. 3 and 4.
8. Calculation : Fractions and compound rules.
9. History : Old Testament from the establishment of the monarchy and the New Testament.
10. Grammar : To the Participles with corresponding exercises.
11. Composition : Narration on easy and usual subjects. Letters to friends.
12. Geography : America, especially the Dominion of Canada.

FIFTH DIVISION.

1. Religious Instruction : The whole Catechism reviewed.
2. Useful Knowledge : Questions on the Earth, the Sun, the Moon, the Stars, the Wind, Lightning and Thunder.
3. Becomingness : Politeness in private and usual conversation and how to answer.
4. Vocal Music : Hymns and Psalms.
5. Spelling and Defining : The words of the Fourth Book.
6. Reading : The Fourth Book, Latin and manuscripts.
7. Writing : On paper and Copy Book's No's. 5 and 6.

8. Calculation : Invoices, Bills and Accounts and review of the four simple and compound rules of decimal and other fractions.

9. History : History of Canada from the discovery to the Treaty of Paris.

10. Grammar : Syntax and punctuation, with corresponding exercises.

11. Composition : Narration on a given sketch and letters to benefactors.

12. Geography : Europe.

13. Drawing : Outlines of maps on slate.

SIXTH DIVISION.

1. Religious Instruction : First portion of Catechism of Perseverence.

2. Useful Knowledge : Elements of Physic and Geometry.

3. Becomingness : In writing and correspondence.

4. Vocal Music : Anthems.

5. Spelling and Defining : The words of the Fifth Book and their synonyms.

6. Reading : Fifth Book, Latin and reading instruction and amusing in Manuscript

7. Writing : On paper and the rest of the copy books.

8. Calculation : Ratio and proportion, percentage, interest, rules of commerce and book-keeping, single entry.

9. History : History of Canada from the Treaty of Paris.

10. Grammar : Syntax with corresponding exercises.

11. Composition : On given subjects, analysis of discourses.

12. Geography : Asia, Africa and Oceania.

13. Drawing : Outlines of maps on paper.

14. Agriculture : Products.

SEVENTH DIVISION.

1. Religious Instruction : Catechism of Perseverance continued.

2. Useful Knowledge : Elements of Botany and Chemistry, and notions of animal kingdom.

3. Becomingness : Order of precedence, forms of address to persons of rank.

4. Vocal Music : Various Singing.

5. Spelling and Defining : The terms of versification.

6. Reading : Instruction and answering, poetry and elocution.

7. Writing : Exercises on commercial forms.

8. Calculation: Arithmetic, Algebra and Book-keeping, double entry.

9. History: History of England and France.

10. Grammar: Logical Analysis.

11. Composition: On subject selected by the pupil and business letters.

12. Geography: Notions on Geology and especially of the Canadian Provinces.

13. Drawing: Geometrical figures.

14. Agriculture: The soil and its preparation.

APPENDIX B.

(p 14).

FULL SETS OF EXAMINATION PAPERS SET BY THE ROMAN CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT SECTIONS.

The following are two full sets of examination papers for candidates for first class teachers' certificates. The first is the paper set by the Roman Catholic section in August, 1881, and the second is that set by the Protestant section in August, 1882. The questions contained in the paper of the Roman Catholic section were the same in 1880, with the exception of grammar, and many of them were used over again in 1882.

A comparison of the two sets of papers will show the high standard required by the Protestant section of the Board of Education, even in 1882, and the farcical nature of the first class teachers' examinations as conducted by the Roman Catholic section :—

(a.) ROMAN CATHOLIC SECTION.

FIRST CLASS.

USEFUL KNOWLEDGE.

How are hail and snow formed ?

How do plants nourish themselves ?

What are the two substances which enter into the composition of water ?

ARITHMETIC.

What is the difference between the true discount and bank discount of \$2,000 for 6 months at 3% ?

Simplify :

$$\frac{5\frac{1}{6} - 4\frac{7}{12}}{12\frac{2}{3} - 7\frac{5}{12}} \div \frac{1 + 2\frac{1}{3}}{2}$$

ALGEBRA.

Give the rule of signs in Algebraic Multiplication.

Find the value of x in the following equation :

$$x + \frac{1}{4}x + \frac{1}{3}x + \frac{x}{6} = 42.$$

BOOK KEEPING.

A merchant sold for \$1,200 ; he received the half in cash

and a note for the rest at 3 months : how will he enter this transaction in his books, keeping them by double entry?

DRAWING.

How do you erect a perpendicular in the middle of a line and at the end?

AGRICULTURE.

Explain the practical drainage.

How do you cultivate turnips?

CATECHISM.

What feasts have their solemnity transferred to Sunday, in this diocese?

How is Lent kept according to the last Indulgence?

BECOMINGNESS.

What are the titles of Civil and Ecclesiastical Dignitaries?

How should we conduct ourselves in a visit to Bishops or Governors?

EDUCATION.

What are the principal means a teacher should employ to have command over his pupils?

In what cases must corporal punishment be resorted to?

HISTORY.

What were the principal causes of the troubles of 1837 in Canada?

When did the union of Upper and Lower Canada take place, and in what did it consist?

Relate the conquest of England by William of Normandy.

GEOGRAPHY.

What are the products peculiar to each of the Provinces of Canada?

What are the principal mines of Canada?

GRAMMAR.

Of what number are the nouns and verbs with which the distributive pronouns agree?

What is the relation of each, every either?

When is an ellipsis not allowable?

When are means and amends to be treated as singular? When as plural?

What is punctuation? What are the chief points used in writing? and what is the use of the semi-colon?

Of what does Analysis treat? Distinguish between a phrase and a clause.

Analyse the following sentence:

"Surely thou who reade'st so much in the Bible, can'st tell me what became of Elijah."

Of what does Prosody treat? What is accent, emphasis and pause?

How many kinds of verse? What are feet and how many kinds?

Scan the following:

"Let saints below with sweet accord,
Unite with those above,
In solemn lays, to praise their King,
And sing his dying love."

COMPOSITION.

What are the advantages of Education?

(B.) PROTESTANT SECTION.

FIRST CLASS.

EUCLID.

1. Any two sides of a triangle are greater than the third side. The difference between any two sides of a triangle is less than the third side.

2. The opposite sides and angles of a parallelogram are equal to one another and the diagonal bisects it; that is, divides it into two equal parts.

Define a rhombus, an oblong, a scalene triangle.

The diagonals of a parallelogram bisect each other.

What changes can be made in the shape and dimensions of a parallelogram without altering the area thereof?

3. To describe a parallelogram equal to a given triangle, and having an angle equal to a given angle.

4. If a straight line be divided into two equal parts, and also into two unequal parts, the rectangle contained by the unequal parts, together with the square on the line between the points of section is equal to the square on half the line.

Construct a rectangle equal to the difference between two given squares.

5. To divide a given straight line into two parts, so that the rectangle contained by the whole and one of the parts may be equal to the square on the other part.

If one side of a triangle be bisected, the sum of the squares on the other two sides is double of the square on half the side bisected and of the square of the line drawn from the point of bisection to the opposite angle of the triangle.

6. If any two points be taken in the circumference of a circle, the straight line which joins them shall fall within the circle.

How would you answer the assertion that this proposition is self-evident?

Through one of the points of intersection of two equal circles draw the longest double chord.

7. The angles in the same segment of a circle are equal to one another.

About the triangle ABC describe a circle, from the points B and C let fall perpendiculars on the opposite sides of the triangle meeting the circumference in E and F respectively, prove that the arc AE is equal to the arc AF .

8. To describe a circle about a given equilateral and equiangular hexagon.

Does Euclid's definition of proportional quantities include incommensurable quantities? Define and explain.

9. If a straight line be drawn parallel to the base of a triangle to cut the sides or the sides produced, it will cut them proportionally; and conversely.

Is this converse universally true?

10. Similar triangles are to one another in the duplicate ratio of their homologous sides.

Bisect a triangle by a line drawn parallel to one of its sides.

ALGEBRA.

1. Investigate a rule for finding the G. C. M. of two algebraical expressions, explaining when and why a factor can be introduced or suppressed.

Find the G. C. M. of $\begin{cases} a^4 \times a^2 x^2 \times x^4 \\ a^4 + a^3 x - a x^3 - x^4. \end{cases}$

2. Find the sum and product of the roots of the equation—
 $x^2 + px + q = 0$.

When will the roots be real and different, real and equal, or impossible?

Form the equation whose roots are

$$\frac{p - \sqrt{q}}{pq} \text{ and } \frac{p + \sqrt{q}}{pq}$$

3. A triangular piece of ground contains 210 square feet and two of the sides are 18 and 25 feet respectively. Find the remaining side.

4. If $\frac{a}{b} = \frac{c}{d} = \frac{e}{f}$ prove $\frac{ace}{bdf} = \frac{a^3 + c^3}{b^3 + d^3}$

Find the square root of $33' + 12\sqrt{6}$

5. Find the Harmonical mean between two quantities.

The sum of three numbers in Harmonical Progression is 33 and their continued product is 972. Find the numbers.

6. Prove that the Arithmetical, Geometrical and Harmonical means between a and b are in order of magnitude, the arithmetical mean being the greatest.

Shew that

$$\frac{p+1}{p-2} + \frac{p}{2} = (pq-p+1) + (pq-p+2) + (pq-p+3) + \dots \text{to } p \text{ terms.}$$

7. If \$600 pay 10 men for 10 weeks' work, for how many weeks will \$540 pay 6 men?

8. If $\begin{cases} a_1 x + b_1 y + c_1 z = 0 \\ a_1 x + b_2 y + c_2 z = 0 \end{cases}$

Shew that $\frac{x}{b_1 c_2 - b_2 c_1} = \frac{y}{c_1 a_2 c_2 a_1} = \frac{z}{a_1 b_2 - a_2 b_1}$

Eliminate x and y from $\begin{cases} x + 2y - c = 0 \\ 2x - y + b = 0 \\ x + y - a = 0 \end{cases}$

9. The number of combinations of n things taken n - r together is equal to the number of them taken r together.

Find the number of combinations that can be made out of the letters in the word binominal taken 3 together.

10. Extract the square root of

$$1 + x^3 + 2(1 - 2x)\sqrt{x} + 3x - x^2.$$

Shew that $3\sqrt[5]{5} = 1 + \frac{4}{3} - \frac{16}{9} + \frac{320}{81} - \frac{2560}{243} + \&c.$

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

1. Characterize briefly the early Anglo-Saxon poetry of England, and name some of the works and writers.

2. Write a short account of the origin and growth of the English Drama.

3. Name the authors of the following works, and ascribe each to its proper literary class:—Ormulum, Shepherd's Calendar, Edward II., The Tempest, Cato, Dunciad, The Excursion, Rokeby, Lycidas, In Memoriam.

4. What has been the influence of the Literatures of France, Germany, Italy and Greece, respectively on our Literature?

5. Which is the chief lyrical age of our Literature? Name some of our chief lyrists.

6. Describe and mention an instance of each of the following:—Ballad, Metrical Romance, Sonnet, Ode, Epic, Monograph.

7. Name some of the novelists and historians of the 18th century with their chief works.

8. Compare Gray and Pope as poets.

PHYSIOLOGY.

1. Describe the bones of the human arm.

2. Give an account of blood corpuscles.

3. How is the blood propelled through the body and describe the mechanism of the organ which accomplishes this end?

4. Describe the lungs of a mammal and shew their use in the system.

5. What are the chief varieties of food-stuffs?

6. Explain the use in the human organism of the gastric juice; of saliva; of bile and pancreatic juice.

7. Explain shortly the process of digestion.

8. To what extent are animals warm, and how do you account for it?

CHEMISTRY.

1. Name the four elements spoken of by the ancients, and show to what extent they were elements.

2. Shew the distinction between chemical and mechanical union.

3. Describe the physical qualities of the elements of common salt, and give the combining equivalents and specific gravities of these elements.

4. Give the manufacture and uses of sulphuric acid.

5. What is an alkali? What is the color of the flame of potash and soda respectively?

6. Give the physical qualities of phosphorous, and describe and explain the phenomenon of burning phosphorus in the limited quantity of air.

7. What are the sources of supply, mode of manufacture, physical qualities, and uses of Iodine?

8. Name the leading ores of copper and its chief combinations. How would you detect copper in a mixture?

STATICS.

1. Define the terms Statics, Volume, Density, Moment.

2. What elements of a force are necessary to ascertain its effects?

3. Find the resultant of two forces of P. lbs. each, acting on a body so as to make an angle of 120° . What angle will the resultant make with each of the forces?

4. A force of 8 lbs acts on a body. The resultant is 10 lbs. The angle made by the given force and the resultant is 30° . — What is the other force and what angle does it make with the given force?

HYDROSTATICS.

1. State the two laws upon which the mathematical theory of Hydrostatics depends.
2. Describe Nicholson's Hydrometer and method of use.
3. How is a Barometer made? Explain its principle.
4. Why is the human body not crushed by the pressure of the atmosphere?

PHYSICS.

1. Distinguish Molecule from Atom.
2. Name the states of aggregation of matter.
3. What is meant by Conservation of Energy.
4. What is a Spectrum? Why does a Prism divide a ray of light?
5. How may positive and negative Electricity be easily developed and distinguished?
6. What is meant by Electrical Induction?

BOTANY.

1. Distinguish the stem from the root of a plant.
2. Describe a cotyledon, and show how the vegetable kingdom is divided on the basis of cotyledons.
3. What is meant by the "veining" of leaves, and explain the leading kinds of venation.
4. Explain the following terms applied to the shapes of leaves: Spathulate, sagittate, obovate, acicular and cuneate.
5. Describe the different parts of a stamen.
6. What are epiphytes and parasites, and give examples?
7. Give examples of plants that are sensitive to the touch.
8. Enumerate the varieties of underground stems.
9. How are fruits divided.

COMPOSITION.

1. Define the following, giving where you can, illustrative quotations or statements: Epigram, antithesis, irony, redundancy, tautology, paraphrase.
2. Point out any defects in construction or style that you may observe in the following, and re-write them, when necessary, in corrected form:

(a) "Particularly as to the affairs of this world, integrity hath many advantages over all the fine and artificial ways of dissimulation and deceit ; it is much the plainer and easier, much the safer and more secure way of dealing with the world ; it has less of trouble and difficulty, of entanglement and prosperity, of danger and hazard in it."

(b) "We came to our journey's end, at last, with no small difficulty, after much fatigue, through deep roads and bad weather."

3. Write an article, suitable for a newspaper or magazine on any one of the following :—

"The Egyptian Question."

"The Commercial Relations of the Old and New Worlds."

"Immigration to the North-West."

HISTORY.

1. Give an account of the origin of the Greek race. Describe briefly the manners, customs and Government of Greece in the Heroic Age.

2. Explain the nature of the Peloponnesian war. Mention the chief men who figured in it. Describe the circumstances under which Greece became a Roman Province, giving the date.

3. When was the city of Rome built? Describe the grievances of the Plebeians in Rome and their efforts to gain their rights.

4. Give a full account of any two of the following battles : Heraclea, Trebea, Cannae, Actium. Name the principal Roman Prose writers.

5. Sketch the chief events in British History up to the time of the English Conquest.

6. Give some account of Dunstan and his administration. Write brief notes on Baeda's life.

7. Name the sovereigns of the Tudor Period, giving their dates. Mention the various authors who flourished under the Tudors and their chief works. Give an account of the Star Chamber.

8. Describe the character of Oliver Cromwell. Discuss his foreign policy and his rule at home.

9. Describe the character and administration of Sir Robert Walpole. When did he live?

10. What events led to the Crimean War? Give a brief account of the principle battles fought and the persons who figured in them.

11. Name the principal discoverers and explorers who appear in early Canadian History. Give a full account of two of them.

12. When was the "Union of the Canadas" effected? Give the terms of union.

BOOK-KEEPING.

SINGLE ENTRY.

1. What are the two principal Books used in single entry called?
2. Describe their uses.
3. What are the two chief auxiliary books called?
4. Describe their uses.
5. From what book do you post to the ledger and what advantages are derived from posting?
6. In what book must be recorded every transaction that you wish to bring into the ledger?

DOUBLE ENTRY.

7. What is double entry?
8. Wherein does it differ from single entry?
9. What test of the ledger is taken when the posting is completed? Describe it,
10. Explain what the Dr. side of profit and loss account shows when the books have been closed, and what the Cr.
11. Explain what the Dr. and what the Cr. of balance account shows after the books have been balanced.

12. Journalise the following :

13. I commenced business with the following effects :

Cash on hand.....	500 00	
Mdse. per Inventory.....	2,000 00	
Sundry notes which I hold against other parties.....	500 00	
J. B. Bennett owes me on acct.....	100 00	
	<hr/>	3,100 00

I owe as follows :

On notes in favor of other parties.....	400 00	
H. King on acct.....	50 00	
	<hr/>	450 00

14. Bo't of Young & Co. goods amt'g
as per invoice to..... 1,000 00

Gave in part payment my order on Webb & Co. for.....	200 00	
H. H. Smith's note in my favor for....	300 00	
My note at 60 days for balance, with in- terest included.....	500 00	

15. Sold Hooper & Co.
500 sacks flour at \$3.00..... 1,500 00
Rec'd in payment my note favor of Young
& Co., due in 30 days..... 510 00

Cash for balance, including discount, on my note not yet due.....	995 00	
The disc. on my note being.....		5 00
16. Accepted A. Grant's draft on me in favor of T. Black at 30 days...		200 00
17. Remitted Turner & Co. a draft which I had purchased for cash,—face of draft.....		500 00
Premium paid.....		2 00

APPENDIX C.

(Page 44)

THE RELIGIOUS EXERCISES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

“Until further notice, the Religious Exercises in the Public Schools shall be :—

(a.) The reading, without note or comment, of the following selections from the Authorized English Version of the Bible or the Douay Version of the Bible,

(b.) The use of the following forms of prayer.

SCRIPTURE READINGS.

PART I.—HISTORICAL.

1. The Creation ... Gen. i, 1—19
2. The Creation—continued ... Gen. i, 20—31
3. The Fall of Man ... Gen. iii,
4. The Deluge ... Gen. viii, 1—22
5. The Covenant with Noah ... Gen. ix, 1—17
6. The Trial of Abraham ... Gen. xxii, 1—18
7. Isaac blesses Jacob ... Gen. xxvii, 1—29
8. Esau's Blessing ... Gen. xxvii, 30—45
9. Jacob's Vision ... Gen. xxviii, 10—22
10. Jacob's Return to Bethel ... Gen. xxxv, 1—15
11. Joseph and his Brethren ... Gen. xxxvii, 1—22
12. Joseph Sold into Egypt ... Gen. xxxvii, 23—36
13. Pharaoh's Dreams ... Gen. xli, 1—24
14. Joseph's Interpretations ... Gen. xli, 25—43
15. Jacob's Sons' Visit ... Gen. xlii, 1—20
16. Jacob's Sons' Return from Egypt ... Gen. xlii, 21—38
17. The Second Visit to Egypt ... Gen. xliii, 1—14
18. Joseph and his Brethren ... Gen. xliii, 15—34
19. Joseph and his Brethren—continued ... Gen. xlii, 1—13
20. Joseph and his Brethren—continued ... Gen. xlii, 14—34
21. Joseph discovers Himself to his Brethren ... Gen. xlv,
22. Jacob and his Household go into Egypt ... Gen. xlv, 1—6, 28—34
23. Jacob's interview with Pharaoh ... Gen. xlvii, 1—12
24. Death of Jacob ... Gen. xlviii, 1—21
25. Burial of Jacob ... Gen. l, 1—26
26. Moses at the Burning Bush ... Exod. iii, 1—20
27. Grievous Oppression of the Hebrews ... Exod. v,
28. The Passover ... Exod. xii, 1—20
29. The Israelites Escape through the Red Sea ... Exod. xiv, 10—31
30. The Song of Deliverance ... Exod. xv, 1—22
31. Giving of Manna ... Exod. xvi, 2—35

32. The Water from the Rock.....Exod. xvii,
33. The Ten Commandments Exod. xx, 1—17
34. The Covenant with Isreal.....Exod. xxiv,
35. The Tabernacle.....Exod. xl, 17—36
36. Spies sent into Canaan Num. xiii, 17—33
37. The People rebel at the Report of the Spies.....Num. xiv, 1—30
38. The Song of Moses.....Deut. xxxii, 1—14
39. The Death of Moses.....Deut. xxxiv,
40. Joshua Succeeds Moses Josh. i, 1—17
41. The Covenant with Joshua Josh. xxiv, 1—28
42. The Call of Samuel.....I Samuel iii,
43. The Israelites desire a King Saml viii, 1—20
44. Samuel anoints Saul.....Saml. ix, 21—27, xi, 1—11
45. Samuel anoints David.....Saml. xvi,
46. David and Goliath Saml. xvii, 1—27
47. David overcomes Goliath Saml. xvii, 28—54
48. David and Jonathan Saml. xviii, 1—16
49. David instructed as to the building of the Temple ..I Chron. xvii, 1—17
50. David's Advice to Solomon I Chron. xxviii, 1—20
51. David's Preparation for building the Temple.....
I Chron. xxix, 1—19
- 52. Solomon's Wise Choice.....I Kings iii, 1—15
53. Preparations for building the Temple.....I Kings v,
54. Solomon's Prayer at the Dedication of the Temple....
II Chron. vi, 1—21
55. Solomon's Prayer—continuedII Chron. vi, 22—42
56. ElijahI Kings xvii,
57. Elijah and the Prophets of Baal.I Kings xviii, 1—21
58. Discomfiture of the Prophets of Baal..I Kings xviii, 22—46
59. Elijah in the Wilderness.....I Kings xix, 1—13
60. Elijah and ElishaII Kings ii, 1—15
61. Naaman the Leper.....II Kings v, 1—19
62. The Fall of IsraelII Kings xvii 6—24
63. Public Worship of God Restored....II Chron. xxix, 20—36
64. Deliverance under HezekiahII Kings xix, 1—19
65. Deliverance under Hezekiah—continued.II Kings xix, 20—36
66. Rejoicing of the Israelites at the Restoration of
Divine Worship.....II Chron. xxx,
67. Jerusalem taken by Nebuchadnezzar..II Chron. xxxvi, 5—21
68. The Golden Image.....Dan. iii, 1—18
69. The Fiery Furnace.....Dan. iii, 19—30
70. Daniel in the Lions' Den.....Dan. vi,
71. The Temple Rebuilt.....Ezra i, 1—6 and iii,

PART 2.—THE GOSPELS.

1. Christ the Word John i, 1—18
2. The Birth of Christ Announced Luke ii, 8—20
3. The visit of the Magi Matth ii, 1—12
4. The Song of Simeon Luke ii, 25—40
5. Jesus in the Temple Luke ii, 41—52
6. The Baptism of Jesus Christ Matth. iii, 1—17
7. The Temptation of our Lord Luke iv, 1—15
8. Testimony of John the Baptist John i, 19—34
9. The First Disciples John i, 35—51
10. Jesus at Nazareth Luke iv, 16—32
11. At Capernaum Matth. iv, 13—25
12. Sermon on the Mount Matth. v, 1—12
13. Sermon on the Mount—continued... Matth. v, 13—20, 33—37
14. Sermon on the Mount—continued..... Matth. v, 38—48
15. Sermon on the Mount—continued..... Matth. vi, 1—18
16. Sermon on the Mount—continued Matth. vi, 19—34
17. Sermon on the Mount—continued..... Matth. vii, 1—14
18. Sermon on the Mount—continued..... Matth. vii, 15—29
19. The Miraculous Draught of Fishes..... Luke v, 1—15
20. The Healing of the Paralytic Luke v, 16—26
21. The Twelve Apostles sent forth . Matth. ix, 36—38, x, 1—11
22. The Centurion's Servant—The Widow's Son.....
Luke vii, 1—17
23. The Declaration Concerning John..... Matth. xi, 2—19
24. The Feast in Simeon's House..... Luke vii, 36—50
25. Privileges and Responsibility Matth. ix, 20—31
26. The Sabbath Luke vi, 1—11
27. Parable of the Sower. Mark iv, 1—20
28. Parable of the Tares, etc..... Matth. xiii, 24—35
29. Parable of the Tares explained, with other Parables....
Matth. xiii, 36—52
30. Children brought to Jesus—Conditions of Discipleship—
Mark x, 13—30
31. Tribute to Cæsar—The Widow's Offering.....
Matth. xxii, 15—22, Mark xii, 41—44
32. Christ Confessed Matth. xvi, 13—28
33. Christ Feeding Five Thousand Mark vi, 30—41
34. Christ Walking on the Sea Matth. xiv, 22—33
35. The Transfiguration..... Matth. xvii, 1—13
36. The Great Supper..... Luke xiv, 7—24

learning ; we pray Thee to imprint upon our minds whatever good instructions we have received, and to bless them to the advancement of our temporal and eternal welfare ; and pardon, we implore Thee, all that thou hast seen amiss in our thoughts, words, and actions. May Thy good Providence still guide and keep us during the approaching interval of rest and relaxation, so that we may be prepared to enter on the duties of the morrow with renewed vigor both of body and mind ; and preserve us we beseech Thee, now and forever, both outwardly in our bodies and inwardly in our souls, for the sake of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Lord, Amen.

Our Father, who art in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in Heaven, give us this day our daily bread ; and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us ; and lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. Amen.

The Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all evermore. Amen.

APPENDIX D.

THE FOUR BILLS OF RIGHTS.

I.—BILL OF RIGHTS.

Proposed to be sent to Governor McDougall, Dec. 1st, 1869.

(See Begg's Creation of Manitoba p. 110.)

1. The right to elect our own Legislature.
2. The Legislature to have power to pass all laws, local to the Territory, over the veto of the Executive, by a two-third vote.
3. No act of the Dominion Parliament (local to this Territory) to be binding on the people until sanctioned by their representatives.
4. All sheriffs, magistrates, constables, etc., etc., to be elected by the people—a free homestead pre-emption law.
5. A portion of the public lands to be appropriated to the benefit of schools, the building of roads, bridges and parish buildings.
6. A guarantee to connect Winnipeg by rail with the nearest line of railroad—the land grant for such road or roads to be subject to the Legislature of the Territory.
7. For four years the public expenses of the Territory, civil, military and municipal, to be paid out of the Dominion Treasury.
8. The military to be composed of the people now existing in the Territory.
9. The French and English language to be common in the Legislature and Council, and all public documents and acts of Legislature to be published in both languages.
10. That the Judge of the Superior Court speak French and English.
11. Treaties to be concluded and ratified between the Government and several tribes of Indians of this Territory, calculated to insure peace in the future.
12. That all privileges, customs and usages existing at the time of the transfer be respected.
13. That these rights be guaranteed by Mr. McDougall before he be admitted into this Territory.
14. If he have not the power himself to grant them, he must get an act of Parliament passed expressly securing us these rights ; and until such act be obtained, he must stay outside the Territory.
15. That we have a full and fair representation in the Dominion Parliament.

II.—LIST OF RIGHTS.

Adopted Feb. 3rd. 1869, by the convention chosen by the people
of Red River Settlement after the meeting with Hon.

Donald A. Smith.

(See Begg's Creation of Manitoba p. 255.)

1. That in view of the present exceptional position of the Northwest, duties upon goods imported into the country shall continue as at present (except in the case of spirituous liquors) for three years, and for such further time as may elapse, until there be uninterrupted railroad communication between Red River settlement and St. Paul, and also steam communication between Red River settlement and Lake Superior.

2. As long as this country remains a territory in the Dominion of Canada, there shall be no direct taxation, except such as may be imposed by the local legislature, for municipal or other local purposes.

3. That during the time this country shall remain in the position of a territory, in the Dominion of Canada, all military, civil, and other public expenses, in connection with the general government of the country, or that have hitherto been borne by the public funds of the settlement, beyond the receipt of the above mentioned duties, shall be met by the Dominion of Canada.

4. That while the burden of public expense in this territory is borne by Canada, the country be governed by a Lieutenant-Governor from Canada, and a Legislature, three members of whom being heads of departments of the Government, shall be nominated by the Governor General of Canada.

5. That after the expiration of this exceptional period, the country shall be governed, as regards its local affairs, as the Provinces of Ontario and Quebec are now governed, by a Legislature by the people, and a Ministry responsible to it, under a Lieutenant-Governor, appointed by the Governor-General of Canada.

6. That there shall be no interference by the Dominion Parliament in the local affairs of this territory, other than is allowed in the provinces, and that this territory shall have and enjoy in all respects, the same privileges, advantages and aids in meeting the public expenses of this territory as the provinces have and enjoy.

7. That, while the Northwest remains a territory, the Legislature have a right to pass all laws local to the territory, over the veto of the Lieutenant-Governor by a two third vote.

8. A homestead and pre-emption law.

9. That while the Northwest remains a territory, the sum of \$25,000 a year be appropriated for schools, roads and bridges.

10. That all public buildings be at the expense of the Dominion treasury.

11. That there shall be guaranteed uninterrupted steam communication to Lake Superior, within five years; and also the establishment, by rail, of a connection with the American railway as soon as it reaches the international line.

12. That the military force required in this country be composed of natives of the country during four years.

[Lost by a vote of 16 yeas to 23 nays, and consequently struck out of the list.]

13. That the English and French languages be common in the Legislature and Courts, and that all public documents and acts of the Legislature be published in both languages.

14. That the Judge of the Supreme Court speak the French and English languages.

15. That treaties be concluded between the Dominion and the several Indian tribes of the country as soon as possible.

16. That, until the population of the country entitles us to more, we have three representatives in the Canadian Parliament, one in the Senate, and two in the Legislative Assembly.

17. That all the properties, rights and privileges as hitherto enjoyed by us be respected, and that the recognition and arrangement of local customs, usages and privileges be made under the control of the Local Legislature.

18. That the Local Legislature of this territory have full control of all the lands inside a circumference having upper Fort Garry as a centre, and that the radius of this circumference be the number of miles that the American line is distant from Fort Garry.

19. That every man in the country except married and unsexed Indians who has attained the age of 21 years, and every French subject a stranger to this country who has resided three years in this country, and a French subject shall have a right to vote in the election of a member to serve in the Legislature of the country, and in the Dominion Parliament, and every French subject who has resided three years in this country who has attained the same length of time in the country, and a French subject shall have the same right to vote or candidate in the electing the path of highway, it being understood that this article be subject to amendments made by the Local Legislature.

20. That the Northwest Territory shall never be sold, while the Dominion of the Republic and the Hudson's Bay Company

or for any portion of the public debt of Canada, as it stands at the time of our entering the confederation; and if, thereafter, we be called upon to assume our share of public debt, we consent only, on condition that we first be allowed the amount for which we shall be held liable.

III.—LIST OF THE TERMS

And conditions which accompanied the commission to Rev. Father Ritchot, J. Black, Esq., Alfred Scott, Esq., given by the Provisional Government.

1. See Begg's "Creation of Manitoba" published 1871, p. 325.

2. This is verbatim the official copy found in the papers of Thomas Bunn, secretary of Riel's government.

3. In the same "Bunn papers" is a copy in French, which differs only in dropping the name "Province of Assiniboia" and substituting "the province."

4. In the same "Bunn papers" is a verbatim copy of this French copy, printed by the Provisional government, and signed "Maison du gouvernement," March 23rd, 1870, the very day Messrs. Ritchot and Scott started for Ottawa.

1. That the territories heretofore known as Rupert's Land and Northwest, shall not enter into the confederation of the Dominion, except as a province, to be styled and known as the Province of Assiniboia, and with all the rights and privileges common to the different provinces of the Dominion.

2. That we have two representatives in the Senate and four in the House of Commons of Canada, until such time as an increase of population entitles the province to a greater representation.

3. That the Province of Assiniboia shall not be held liable at any time for any portion of the public debt of the Dominion contracted before the date the said province shall have entered the confederation, unless the said province shall have first received from the Dominion the full amount for which the said province is to be held liable.

4. That the sum of eighty thousand dollars be paid annually by the Dominion Government to the Local Legislature of the Province.

5. That all properties, rights and privileges enjoyed by the people of this province up to the date of our entering into the confederation be respected, and that the arrangement and confirmation of all customs, usages and privileges be left exclusively to the Local Legislature.

6. That during the term of five years, the Province of Assiniboia shall not be subjected to any direct taxation, except such as may be imposed by the Local Legislature for municipal or local purposes,

7. That a sum of money equal to eighty cents per head of the population of this province be paid annually by the Canadian Government to the Local Legislature of the said province, until such time as the said population shall have increased to six hundred thousand.

8. That the Local Legislature shall have the right to determine the qualifications of members to represent this province in the Parliament of Canada, and in the Local Legislature.

9. That in this Province, with the exception of uncivilized and unsettled Indians, every male native citizen who has attained the age of twenty-one years; and every foreigner, being a British subject who has attained the same, and has resided three years in the Province, and is a householder; and every foreigner, other than a British subject, who has resided here during the same period, being a householder and having taken the oath of allegiance, shall be entitled to vote at the election of members for the Local Legislature and for Canadian Parliament. It being understood that this article be subject to amendment exclusively by the Local Legislature.

10. That the bargain of the Hudson's Bay Company in the respect to the transfer of the government of this country to the Dominion of Canada be annulled so far as it interferes with the rights of the people of Assiniboia, and so far as it would affect our future relations with Canada.

11. That the Local Legislature of the Province of Assiniboia shall have full control over all the public lands of the Province, and the right to annul all acts or arrangements made or entered into with reference to the public lands of Rupert's Land and the Northwest, now called the Province of Assiniboia.

12. That the Government of Canada appoint a commissioner of engineers to explore the various districts of the Province of Assiniboia, and to lay before the Local Legislature a report of the mineral wealth of the Province within five years from the date of our entering into confederation.

13. That treaties be concluded between Canada and the different Indian tribes of the Province of Assiniboia by and with the advice and co-operation of the Local Legislature of this Province.

14. That an uninterrupted steam communication from Lake Superior to Fort Garry be guaranteed to be completed within the space of five years.

15. That all public buildings, bridges, roads and other public works be at the cost of the Dominion treasury.

16. That the English and French languages be common in the Legislature and in the Courts, and that all public documents, as well as all acts of the Legislature, be published in both languages.

17. That whereas the French and English speaking people of Assiniboia are so equally divided as to numbers, yet so united in their interests, and so connected by commerce, family connections, and other political and social relations, that it has happily been found impossible to bring them into hostile collision, although repeated attempts have been made by designing strangers, for reasons known to themselves, to bring about so ruinous and disastrous an event.

And whereas after all the trouble and apparent dissensions of the past, the result of misunderstanding among themselves, they have, as soon as the evil agencies referred to above were removed, become as united and friendly as ever; therefore as a means to strengthen this union and friendly feeling among all classes, we deem it expedient and advisable,

That the Lieutenant-Governor, who may be appointed for the Province of Assiniboia, should be familiar with both the English and French languages.

18. That the Judge of the Superior Court speak the English and French languages.

19. That all debts contracted by the Provisional government of the territory of the Northwest, now called Assiniboia, in consequence of the illegal and inconsiderate measures adopted by Canadian officials to bring about a civil war in our midst, be paid out of the Dominion treasury, and that none of the members of the Provisional government, or any of those acting under them; be in any way held liable or responsible with regard to the movement or any of the actions which led to the present negotiations.

20. That in view of the present exceptional position of Assiniboia, duties upon goods imported into the Province shall, except in the case of spirituous liquors, continue as at present for at least three years from the date of our entering the confederation, and for such further time as may elapse until there be uninterrupted railroad communication between Winnipeg and St. Paul, and also steam communication between Winnipeg and Lake Superior.

IV.—RIEL'S FICTITIOUS BILL OF RIGHTS.

First published by Archbishop Tache in the Daily Free Press of
December 27th, 1889.

1. That the territory of the Northwest enter into the Confederation of the Dominion of Canada as a province, with all the privileges common with all the different provinces in the Dominion.

That this province be governed :

1. By a Lieutenant-Governor, appointed by the Governor-General of Canada.

2. By a Senate.

3. By a Legislature chosen by the people with a responsible ministry.

2nd. That, until such time as the increase of the population in this country entitle us to a greater number, we have two representatives in the Senate and four in the Commons of Canada.

3. That in entering the Confederation the Province of the Northwest be completely free from the public debt of Canada ; and if called upon to assume a part of the said debt of Canada, that it be only after having received from Canada the same amount for which the said Province of the Northwest should be held responsible.

4. That the annual sum of \$80,000 be allotted by the Dominion of Canada to the Legislature of the Province of the Northwest.

5. That all properties, rights and privileges enjoyed by us up to this day be respected, and that the recognition and settlement of customs, usages and privileges be left exclusively to the decision of the Local Legislature.

6. That this country be submitted to no direct taxation except such as may be imposed by the Local Legislature for municipal or other local purposes.

7. That the schools be separate, and that the public money for schools be distributed among the different religious denominations in proportion to their respective populations, according to the system of the Province of Quebec.

8. That the determination of the qualifications of members for the parliament of the province or for the parliament of Canada be left to the Local Legislature.

9. That in this province, with the exception of the Indians, who are neither civilized nor settled, every man having attained

the age of 21 years, and every foreigner being a British subject, after having resided three years in this country, and being possessed of a house, be entitled to vote at the elections for the members of the Local Legislature and of the Canadian Parliament, and that every foreigner other than a British subject, having resided here during the same period, and being proprietor of a house, be likewise entitled to vote on condition of taking the oath of allegiance.

It is understood that this article is subject to amendment, by the Local Legislature exclusively.

10. That the bargain of the Hudson Bay Company with respect to the transfer of government of this country to the Dominion of Canada, never have in any case an effect prejudicial to the rights of Northwest.

11. That the Local Legislature of this Province have full control over all the lands of the Northwest.

12. That a commission of engineers appointed by Canada explore the various districts of the Northwest, and lay before the Local Legislature within the space of five years a report of the mineral wealth of the country.

13. That treaties be concluded between Canada and the different Indian tribes of the Northwest, at the request and with the co-operation of the Local Legislature.

14. That an uninterrupted steam communication from Lake Superior to Fort Garry be guaranteed to be completed within the space of five years, as well as the construction of a railroad connecting the American railway as soon as the latter reaches the international boundary.

15. That all public buildings and constructions be at the cost of the Canadian Exchequer.

16. That both the English and French languages be common in the Legislature and in the Courts; and that all public documents as well as the acts of the Legislature be published in both languages.

17. That the Lieutenant-Governor to be appointed for the province of the Northwest be familiar with both the English and French languages.


18. That the Judge of the Supreme Court speak the English and French languages.

19. That all debts contracted by the Provisional government of the territory of the Northwest, now called Assinibola, in consequence of the illegal and inconsiderate measures adopted by Canadian officials to bring about a civil war in our midst, be paid out of the Dominion treasury, and that none of the Provisional government, or any of those acting under them, be in any way held liable or responsible with regard to the movement or any of the actions which led to the present negotiations.

NOTE.—Archbishop Tache explains in a letter, in the Free Press, Jan. 15th, 1890, that the sheet on which clause 20 was written had been lost sight of.—G. B.

The above appendix is taken bodily from transaction 38 of the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba, entitled "Two Provisional Governments in Manitoba," by Rev. Professor Bryce, L.L.D., read before the society Jan. 9th, 1890.





**The Manitoba school question.
Gutman Library**

[REDACTED]

3 2044 028 969 459

[illegible]

DEMCO 38-297

